270.32
F641

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

Society for Promoting Religion
and Learning

D & T RDV

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/riseofmediaevalc0000alex_e1w0

THE RISE OF THE MEDIAEVAL CHURCH

AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE CIVILISATION OF WESTERN EUROPE FROM THE FIRST TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

BY

ALEXANDER CLARENCE FLICK, PH. D., LITT. D.

PROFESSOR OF EUROPEAN HISTORY IN SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

CITY COLLEGE LIBRARY NEW YORK

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1909

270.3Q
F641

49596

COPYRIGHT, 1909
BY
ALEXANDER CLARENCE FLICK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

TO

HENRY C. LEA

Who through his numerous scholarly monographs has earned the foremost place among American Church historians, both at home and abroad,

AND TO

PROFESSOR DOCTOR ADOLPH HARNACK

To whom both the Old and the New World are profoundly indebted for his scholarly labours, and from whose inspiration in public lectures and private conferences this work derived much that is best in it,

THIS BOOK IS GRATEFULLY DEDICATED.

PREFACE

THE educational value of any subject depends primarily upon its own intrinsic value. The teaching of Church history for ten years as a regular course in liberal arts, side by side with the "orthodox" courses in history, has demonstrated beyond question that this subject can be made at once very popular and very valuable. It has proved its right to exist as a cultural subject. Yet the lack of intelligent information, even among educated people, concerning the history of the Christian Church, both in early and modern days, is simply appalling.

The comparatively recent revival of interest in Church history has given birth to many general Church histories from English and American scholars. Numerous translations of discriminating and painstaking German authors are also available. A large number of intensive monographs has likewise appeared. But all these texts are written for classes in theological schools. Not a single Church history suitable either for regular college work, or for popular reading, is available; and yet all the standard courses in history are provided with up-to-date texts and illustrative material.

This work is intended to meet the need I have felt in my own classes, and have heard expressed from fellow teachers and laymen, for a simple account of

the evolution of the old Church minus all theological and dogmatic discussions. The purpose has been to show the origin of the Christian Church, its development in organisation, the forces which produced the Papacy, and the marvellous, formative influence of the Roman Church upon the civilisation of Western Europe. To that end the principal lines of development are emphasised at every point, while the subordinate influences have been minimised. Causes and results, continuity and differentiation, and unity have been constantly kept in mind.

The subject-matter of this volume was worked out during a prolonged residence in Europe. Most of that time was spent in Germany under the inspiration of the foremost authorities in Church history, among whom may be mentioned Professor Nippold of Jena, Professor Loofs of Halle, Professor Hauck of Leipzig, and particularly Professor Harnack of Berlin. The work of the lecture-room and seminar was supplemented by investigation in the Royal Library of Berlin, the Vatican Library at Rome, the National Library at Paris, and the Library of the British Museum. The materials thus gathered were further organised and elaborated in a course of lectures on Church history given in Syracuse University.

The references in the text and the bibliographies at the end of chapters are given, so far as possible, to English sources. It is believed that the exclusion of a pedantic list of foreign works will make the work more useful. It is hoped that the student will be induced to go to the library, the laboratory of the historian, and there by extensive and intensive reading supplement the text.

Should this volume prove to be of service, it will be followed by two companion volumes—one on the Reformation and another on the modern Church. It is further planned to publish a source-book on Church history to supplement the texts.

My indebtedness to books and men is so great that it would be impossible to enumerate them here. While all sources have been laid under tribute, special obligation is felt to many monographs and intensive studies.

Alexander C. Flick.

Syracuse University.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY 1

OUTLINE: I.—Present status of history in college work. II.—Ecclesiastical history excluded since the Reformation by political history. III.—New view of the Mediæval Church and its influence. IV.—Renaissance of interest in Church history. V.—Pedagogical value and treatment of Church history. VI.—Sources.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CHURCH HISTORY . . 12

OUTLINE: I.—Primary materials. II.—Secondary materials. III.—Sketch of the writing of Church history. IV.—Most important collections of primary sources. V.—Most important general Church histories. VI.—Dictionaries and encyclopedias. VII.—Atlases and chronologies. VIII.—Text-books. IX.—Sources.

CHAPTER III

PREPARATION OF THE CIVILISED WORLD FOR THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH 40

OUTLINE: I.—The ancient world. II.—Condition of the civilised world at the time Jesus came. III.—How the condition of the world prepared the way for Christianity. IV.—Sources.

CHAPTER IV

ORIGIN, SPREAD, AND ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH DURING THE APOSTOLIC AGE 52

OUTLINE: I.—Origin of the Christian Church. II.—Spread of the Apostolic Church. III.—Organisation of the Early Church. IV.—Conclusions. V.—Sources.

PAGE

CHAPTER V

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND PETER'S PRIMACY . . 71

OUTLINE: I.—Planting of the Church in Rome and its organisation there. II.—The two opposing views of the Petrine theory. III.—Proofs advanced for the Petrine theory. IV.—Evidence given against the Petrine theory. V.—Historical conclusions. VI.—Sources.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT'S TREATMENT OF THE CHRISTIANS 91

OUTLINE: I.—Religious persecutions before the Christian era. II.—Christians first persecuted by the Jews. III.—Causes and motives of persecution by the Roman government. IV.—Number and general character of the persecutions. V.—Results of persecutions. VI.—Sources.

CHAPTER VII

TRANSITION OF THE CHURCH UNDER CONSTANTINE . 112

OUTLINE: I.—Condition of the Empire in 300. II.—How Constantine became Emperor. III.—Constantine's conversion to Christianity. IV.—Constantine's favours to Christianity. V.—Constantine's character. VI.—Constantine's historical significance. VII.—Sources.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA AND ITS RESULTS . . 131

OUTLINE: I.—Diversion of Christian thought in the early Church. II.—The Arian controversy. III.—The Council of Nicæa and its actions. IV.—Later history of Arianism. V.—Sources.

CHAPTER IX

RISE OF THE PAPACY 148

OUTLINE: I.—Favourable conditions when the Christian era began. II.—Forces at work up to 313. III.—Description of the Roman Church in 313. IV.—Growth of the Papacy from 313 to 604. V.—Condition of the Papacy at the close of this period, 604. VI.—Sources.

PAGE

CHAPTER X

RISE OF THE PAPACY (*Continued*) 164

CHAPTER XI

MONASTICISM 198

OUTLINE: I.—Importance of the institution of monasticism. II.—Antecedents and analogies. III.—Causes of the origin of Christian monasticism. IV.—Evolution of Christian monasticism. V.—Spread of group monasticism from the East to the West. VI.—Development of monasticism in Western Europe. VII.—Opposition to monasticism. VIII.—Results and influences of monasticism. IX.—Sources.

CHAPTER XII

SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OVER EUROPE . 229

OUTLINE: I.—Extent of Christianity under Gregory the Great. II.—Character of missionary work from the sixth to the tenth century. III.—Conversion of the British Isles. IV.—Conversion of the Franks. V.—Conversion of the Germans. VI.—Conversion of Scandinavia. VII.—Planting of the Church among the Slavs. VIII.—Efforts to convert the Mohammedans. IX.—Sources.

CHAPTER XIII

SEPARATION OF THE ROMAN AND GREEK CHURCHES . 265

OUTLINE: I.—Relation of the Greek and Roman Churches before 325. II.—Effect of the Arian Controversy on the situation. III.—The history of image worship. IV.—Character and results of the Iconoclastic Controversy. V.—Final separation. VI.—Resemblances and differences between the two churches. VII.—Sources.

CHAPTER XIV

RELATION OF THE CHURCH AND STATE UP TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE . . 289

OUTLINE: I.—Church and state before Constantine. II.—Church and state from Constantine to 476. III.—Period of the Ostrogothic rule (476–552). IV.—Reunion of Italy with the Eastern Empire. V.—Alliance between the Papacy and the Franks. VI.—Restoration of the Empire in the West in 800. VII.—Effect of the rise of national states on the Church. VIII.—Sources.

PAGE

CHAPTER XV

THE PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS AND THE PAPAL CONSTITUTION 326

OUTLINE: I.—What were the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals? II.—Condition of Europe when the Decretals appeared. III.—Purpose of the forgery. IV.—Character and composition. V.—Time, place, and personality of authorship. VI.—Significance and results. VII. Nicholas I. and papal supremacy. VIII.—Decline of spirituality in the Church. IX.—Sources.

CHAPTER XVI

ORGANISATION, LIFE, AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHURCH, SIXTH TO NINTH CENTURY 347

OUTLINE: I.—Organisation of the papal hierarchy. II.—Moral condition of the clergy and laity. III.—Great activity and wide influence of the Church. IV.—The ordeals and the Church. V.—Church discipline: excommunication and interdict, and penance. VI.—Worship; the mass; preaching; hymns. VII.—The sacraments. VIII.—Relics and saints. IX.—Sources.

CHAPTER XVII

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE AND THE PAPACY . . 384

OUTLINE: I.—Decline of the Empire under the later Carolingians. II.—Preparations to restore the Empire on a German basis. III.—Otto the Great creates the Holy Roman Empire. IV.—Holy Roman Empire attains its height under Henry III. V.—Results of the creation of the Holy Roman Empire. VI.—Sources.

CHAPTER XVIII

PREPARATIONS FOR THE HILDEBRANDINE REFORMATION 418

OUTLINE: I.—Decline of the Papacy after Nicholas I. (858–867). II.—Reform efforts before the time of Hildebrand. III.—The youth and education of Hildebrand. IV.—The Hildebrandine Popes. V.—Sources.

PAGE

CHAPTER XIX

GREGORY VII. AND HIS WORK 445

OUTLINE: I.—Condition of the Church in 1073. II.—Election of Hildebrand as Pope. III.—Gregory VII.'s matured papal theory and reform ideas. IV.—His efforts to realise his ideals. V.—The investiture strife. VI.—Conclusions. VII.—Sources.

CHAPTER XX

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CRUSADES 476

OUTLINE: I.—The rise and spread of Mohammedanism. II.—Positive and negative causes of the Crusades. III.—Character and description of the Crusades. IV.—Results and influences of the Crusades. V.—Sources.

CHAPTER XXI

RISE OF THE MENDICANT ORDERS IN THE CHURCH . 510

OUTLINE: I.—Monasticism before the Crusades. II.—Effect of the Crusades on monasticism. III.—Origin of the begging orders. IV.—Rise and influence of the Dominicans. V.—Origin and power of the Franciscans. VI.—Wide-spread results of mediæval monasticism. VII.—Sources.

CHAPTER XXII

INNOCENT III. AND THE CHURCH AT ITS HEIGHT . 544

OUTLINE: I.—Antecedent preparation for this period. II.—Career of Innocent III. up to 1198. III.—Innocent III.'s plans and ideals as Pope. IV.—Condition of Europe at the close of the twelfth century. V.—Innocent III. makes himself the political head of Europe. VI.—Innocent III.'s efforts to root out heresy and reform the Church. VII.—Innocent III.'s character and the general results of his pontificate. VIII.—Sources.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AT ITS HEIGHT 569

OUTLINE: I.—Characteristics of the thirteenth century. II.—Territorial extent and wealth of the Church. III.—Organisation of the papal hierarchy completed. IV.—The legal system of the Church. V.—The official language and ritual of the Church. VI.—The sacramental system. VII.—The employment of art. VIII.—The Church moulded the civilisation of Europe. IX.—Sources.

INDEX 607

THE RISE OF THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY[1]

OUTLINE: I.—Present status of history in college work. II.—Ecclesiastical history excluded since the Reformation by political history. III.—New view of the mediæval Church and its influence. IV.—Renaissance of interest in Church history. V.—Pedagogical value and treatment of Church history. VI.—Sources

HALF a century ago a prominent educator observed: "There is something remarkable in the actual condition of the study of Church history. While it seems to be receiving more and more cultivation from a few of us, it fails to command the attention of the educated public in the same proportion. We are strongly of the opinion that beyond the requisitions of academical and professional examination there is very little reading of Church history in any way."[2] Only twenty-five years ago Professor Emerton, upon taking the chair of ecclesiastical history in Harvard University, could say with truth: "There

[1] Reprinted from *The Methodist Review*, Jan., 1905.

[2] *Bib. Rep.*, vol. xxvi.

are to-day not more than half a dozen colleges in the country where any adequate provision for an independent department of history has been made."[1] At the present time, happily, the condition so much deplored in the last quotation has been remedied to a very large degree. Every great university in America has a well-organised faculty of history and allied subjects, while a large majority of the smaller institutions of higher education have regularly organised departments of history with instructors, well-trained at home or abroad, who devote all their time to the subject.

But, notwithstanding these facts, the statement made about Church history still remains essentially true. The political, industrial, educational, and social sides of history have been emphasised by the creation of new departments with new courses of study, and by the writing of many text-books, monographs, and general treatises. Professorships of sociology, political economy, political science, constitutional law, education, and literature have been created in unprecedented numbers. Ecclesiastical history, on the contrary, has been all but ignored. Even in Germany, where the greatest strides have been made in the subject, it is still relegated to the theological faculty, though the number of philosophical students selecting it often exceeds that of the theological—a very significant fact. In America it would be difficult to point out more than a very few universities or colleges where a chair in Church history is put on an equality with chairs of other branches of history or of correlated subjects. Its proper place, in both scholastic and popular estimation, is in the theological seminary,

[1] *Unit. Rev.*, vol. xix.

and there it has always remained as a "professional" study. Even in this restricted sense, however, its intrinsic worth has placed it among the most important courses in the curriculum, and has given it a standing beyond "professional" circles. Some of America's greatest scholars have contributed powerfully, through the class-room, lectures, and books, to give Church history its rightful place both as a "professional" and as a "liberal" branch of learning.

Until Luther led the great reformatory schism in the sixteenth century, all historians, crude and unscientific though much of their work was, recognised the necessary union of political and ecclesiastical history. The Venerable Bede began his celebrated history not with the coming of Abbot Augustine and his monks, but with the landing of Cæsar and his Roman cohorts. As modern civilisation crept over western Europe and crossed the mighty deep to Columbia's shores, carrying with it the revolutionising Teutonic conception of the national state with its new duties and relationships, the tendency was to magnify the political and social sides of history at the expense of the religious. The hatreds and misunderstandings of the Reformation, though doing something to rectify the "orthodox" history of the old Church, really put members of the old organisation wholly on the defensive, and checked for centuries anything like a genuinely sympathetic and scientific study of the old Church by Protestant historians. With Neander, that sympathetic Christian of Jewish descent, and the scholarly Gieseler, a new era opened. The growing doctrine of the separation of Church and state accentuated the breach between political and religious history. The early crude conception of specialisation also separated sacred from profane

history, and turned the former over wholly to the theologian. Secular historians took the position of Napoleon when invited to enter the Holy City: "Jerusalem does not enter into the line of my operations."

At last the Church historian and the civic historian have joined hands, and look each other in the face. They see that their aim is essentially common: to know the truth about the past. This search for truth for its own sake is purely modern—almost contemporaneous. Formerly, history was written to justify or disprove some theory of political or ecclesiastical polity, or to glorify some dynasty, sect, party, or hero, or to vindicate some hypothesis or set of ideas. The historian was not a searcher for truth, but a lawyer with a cause to plead. It is generally realised now that the historian, whether he deals with the state, the Church, society, education, or industry, is working an important part of the field of general history. A knowledge of each one of these institutions is necessary to supplement and explain any or all of the others.

This institutional interdependence seems to be generally recognised now. "The web of history," said Professor Hatch in beginning his great work at Oxford, "is woven of one piece; it reflects the unity of human life, of which it is the record. We cannot isolate any group of facts and consider that no links of causation connect them with their predecessors or their contemporaries. Just as Professor Freeman insists on the continuity of history, so I wish to insist on its solidarity."[1] The mutual labours of scholars in cor-

[1] Hatch, *An Introductory Lecture on the Study of Ecclesiastical History*, London, 1885. Comp. Gwatkin, *The Meaning of Ecclesiastical History*, Cambridge, 1891.

relating fields have revolutionised our historical knowledge of the early and later Middle Ages. A multitude of controverted points have vanished like ghosts. We see the old Church now as we never saw it before. The Catholic Church and the mediæval papacy were the greatest of the creations of the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. The mediæval Church was not exclusively a religious organisation. It was more of an ecclesiastical state. It had laws, lawyers, courts, and prisons. If not born into it, all the people of western Europe were at least baptised into it. It levied taxes on its subjects. Standards of patriotism and treason were more sharply defined than in the modern state.[1] The evolution of this great organisation is the central fact of the first thirteen centuries after Christ. It aimed to control the whole life of its subjects here and to determine their destiny hereafter. Well may our greatest American Church historian, Henry C. Lea, ask: "What would have been the condition of the world if that organisation had not succeeded in bearing the ark of Christianity through the wilderness of the first fifteen centuries?"[2]

The history of Europe, then, after the Roman period must be looked at through the eyes of the Church. The character and works of that great institution must first be studied, not pathologically but sympathetically. The historian, if honest, dare not show a "lack of appreciation of the service rendered to humanity by the organisation which in all ages has assumed for itself the monopoly of the heritage of Christ."[3] He must recognise the fact that "ecclesiastical history is simply

[1] Maitland, *Canon Law in the Church of England*, London, 1898, 100, 101.

[2] Lea, *Studies in Church History*, p. iii.

[3] *Ibid.*

the spiritual side of universal history."[1] "The value of a science depends on its own intrinsic merits," says Alzog.[2] When the great Teacher commanded from the Mount of Olives, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," that mount became the pivot on which the whole world's history has turned.

If the Christian religion be a matter, not of mint, anise, and cummin, but of justice, mercy, and truth; if the Christian religion be not a priestly caste, or a monastic order, or a little sect, or a handful of opinions, but the whole congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the world; if the very word which of old represented the chosen "people" is now to be found in the "laity"; if the biblical usage of the phrase "ecclesia" literally justifies Tertullian's definition: *Ubi tres sunt laici, ibi est ecclesia;* then the range of the history of the Church is as wide as the range of the world which it was designed to penetrate.[3]

The great difficulty with the study of Church history in the past has been that teachers treated it wholly from a theological standpoint. That may have been proper when the subject was viewed as a narrow "professional" study only. A new and better conception of the subject, however, as a part of the pregnant history of humanity, has brought with it a higher estimation of its value as a cultural study. All that can be claimed for historical studies in general can be claimed for it: mental discipline, broad culture, a view of practical life, enlarged sympathies and lessened prejudices, a truer conception of duty, and a saner estimate of the significance of current events. In addition it may be ventured that no subject can be of greater

[1] Gwatkin, *The Meaning of Ecclesiastical History*, 8.
[2] Alzog, *Universal Church History*, i., § 13.
[3] Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Introduction, 25.

vital importance to the student for the very reason that it deals with the most important of all subjects. In order to do the most good as a liberal branch of learning, Church history must be taught not as theology or dogma, but as a powerful civilising institution like the state or the school. Then it will be true that "neither can the profane historian, the jurist, the statesman, the man of letters, the artist, nor the philosopher safely neglect the study of Church history."[1] For each one of these persons, as well as the minister, needs that "pragmatic view" of all the changes and developments of the Christian Church and the influence it has exerted on all other human relations.[2]

Within the last few years, however, there has been a noticeable awakening of interest in Church history both within and without college walls. The indefatigable labours of a few men like Henry C. Lea, who has given us a series of invaluable monographs on the history of the old Church, have had much to do with the new status of Church history. Universities are already recognising courses in Church history offered by divinity schools as "liberal arts" electives for undergraduate and postgraduate study. The writers of recent text-books on general history, as well as in particular fields, recognise the revolution and try to make amends for the sin of omission by giving the Church a prominence never recognised before by secular historians.[3] Publishers have felt the popular pulse and, consequently, "Studies" and "Epochs"

[1] Alzog, i., 32.

[2] Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History*, sec. 3 and 7.

[3] Examine recently published texts like Emerton, *Mediæval Europe;* Robinson, *History of Western Europe;* Munro, *A History of the Middle Ages*, etc.

covering the whole range of Church history have appeared in cheap and popular form from the pen of scholar and compiler. Foreign works have been translated. Journals devoted to the study of Church history have been established. Lectureships have been created and endowed. Societies have been organised to further the work. Convenient editions of the "sources" are appearing. Everywhere there seems to be a reaction in favour of this misunderstood and neglected subject. An army of scholars is at work digging valuable material out of old monasteries, royal archives, private libraries, cemeteries and churches, catacombs, and every conceivable place of concealment. These labours are being rewarded by rich discoveries of valuable materials, which are immediately critically edited by competent hands and printed in translations suitable for all students. Huge collections of these sources are appearing in most of the European countries.[1]

The most significant evidence of reaction, however, lies in the fact that the most recent courses offered on the Middle Ages in our leading universities are essentially courses in Church history. The name matters little so long as students approach the instructive history of western Europe from the right standpoint. Thus, at length, has come the fulfilment of the prophecy of Professor Koethe (d. 1850), made many years ago: "It is reserved to future ages, and in a special sense to the institutions of learning, to give to Church history its proper place in the curriculum of studies. When its nature and importance come to be fully known and appreciated it will be no longer limited to one faculty."

[1] The *Monumenta* in Germany, the *Rolls Series* in England, etc.

The best pedagogical methods must be applied to Church history in order to obtain the best results. To that end these practical suggestions are offered:

1. Emphasis ought to be laid on ideas back of events rather than on the events themselves.

2. The important ought to be distinguished from the unimportant at every step. Athanasius and Augustine are worthier subjects of study than Flavian and Optatus. The invasion and conversion of the Teutons are more important than disputes over Easter or the shape of the tonsure.

3. Original sources ought to be used so far as possible. History should be studied "from the sources of friend and foe, in the spirit of truth and love, *sine ira et studio.*"[1]

4. Both Protestant and Catholic secondary authorities ought to be read on every important controverted point.

5. Origins ought to be studied with special care.

6. Transition periods rather than crises ought to be given the most time.

7. Biographies of epoch-making men like Constantine, Gregory the Great, Charlemagne, Hildebrand, St. Francis, Innocent III., etc., ought to be carefully considered.

8. Causes and results ought to be closely worked out and classified.[2]

9. The continuity of the Church as a great force in the world ought to be ever kept in mind.[3]

10. Differentiation ought to be thoughtfully noted through the ages.

[1] Schaff, *Church History*, preface.

[2] Mace, *Method in History*, 27–39.

[3] Freeman, *Methods of Historical Study*, Lond. and N. Y., 1886.

11. The unity of history—the influence of the Church upon every other institution—ought to be followed from one transitional period to another.

12. The sympathetic attitude ought to be taken at all times in judging men and movements. The student ought to stand in the centre of the circle so that he may see all points of the circumference —all persons, all events, all parties, all creeds, all sects, all shades of opinion—and see their true historical relations.

Sources

1.—Bright, W., *The Study of Church History.* In *Waymarks of Church History.* N. Y., 1894.
2.—Cave, A., *Introduction to the Study of Theology.* Edinb., 1885, 421 *ff.*
3.—Collins, W. E., *The Study of Ecclesiastical History.* N. Y., 1903.
4.—Coxe, A. C., *Institutes of Christian History.* Chicago, 1887.
5.—De Witt, J., *Church History as a Science, as a Theological Discipline, and as a Mode of the Gospel.* Cinc., 1883.
6.—Foster, F. H., *The Seminary Method of Original Study in the Historical Sciences.* N. Y., 1888.
7.—Gwatkin, H. M., *The Meaning of Ecclesiastical History.* Camb., 1891.
8.—Hatch, E., *An Introductory Lecture on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.* Lond., 1885.
9.—Hitchcock, R. D. *The True Idea and Uses of Church History.* N. Y., 1856.
10.—Jortin, J., *The Use and Importance of Ecclesiastical History. Works*, vii., 405–454. Lond., 1772.
11.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.* Introd. Phil., 1869.
12.—McGiffert, A. C., "The Historical Study of Christianity." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1893, 150–171.
13.—Robinson, J. H., *Sacred and Profane History.* In *An. Rep. Am. Hist. Assn.* 1899, i., 527.
14.—Smith, H. B., "Nature and Worth of the Science of

Church History." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. vii., 1851, 412. See *Faith and Philosophy*, Edinb. and N.Y., 1877, 49–86.

15.—Smyth, E. C., *Value of the Study of Church History in Ministerial Education.* Andover, 1874.

16.—Stanley, A. P., *Three Introductory Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.* In *History of the Eastern Church.* Lond. and N. Y., 1884, 17–76.

See the introductions of the Church histories of Schaff, Gieseler, Alzog, Moeller, Kurtz, Hase, Döllinger, and Hergenröther.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CHURCH HISTORY

OUTLINE: I.—Primary materials. II.—Secondary materials. III.—Sketch of the writing of Church history. IV.—Most important collections of primary sources. V.—Most important general Church histories. VI.—Dictionaries and encyclopedias. VII.—Atlases and chronologies. VIII.—Text-books. IX.—Sources.

ALL our information about the origin, life, and growth of the Christian Church comes from the revelation of evidence which is termed sources. These sources are partly original, or primary, and partly secondary. For the student of history both kinds of sources have a definite character and value, and are, therefore, of peculiar interest. Some knowledge about the scope and nature of the sources is necessary for an intelligent view of any field of history. At the same time it is clear that any person presuming to pose as an authority on a given phase of history must not only be thoroughly acquainted with the varied contributions of all secondary works, but must also be a master of the character and worth of all first-hand materials.

The primary sources are simply the records and remains left by the people who lived at any given time. Such materials, it will be readily seen, give the nearest and truest account of the ideas, feelings, motives, and beliefs, as well as of the deeds and actions, of man. An original source is, therefore, merely a source back

of which one cannot go for historical information. It is apparent, consequently, that the primary sources are the more important because they are the very foundations of history. "No documents, no history," tersely declared Langlois. The primary sources put us in vital connection with the thoughts, doings, and institutions of past times. In them one sees reflected the spirit of the age. Every line, every word, is a revelation. The student is led to feel history, to actually know men and women of the past, and thus to comprehend our own civilisation in the earlier periods of its evolution. The primary sources cannot be accepted and assigned their true value, however, until their authenticity and genuineness are determined, and the element of personal equation is taken into account. Even then final judgment can never be absolute.

For the sake of giving a clear conception of the range of the primary sources the following classification may be of assistance:

A.—Written sources of the subjoined kind:

I.—Public official documents:

1. Acts of councils and synods.
2. Letters, bulls, briefs, rescripts, and regests of popes, patriarchs, and bishops.
3. Confessions of faith.
4. Liturgies, hymns, etc.
5. Church canons and laws, and monastic rules.
6. Decrees and letters of kings, nobles, and civic assemblies.
7. Laws of states.

II.—Private writings of personal actors and observers:

1. The Apostles.
2. Church fathers.
3. Heretics and reformers.
4. Heathen.
5. Chroniclers and historians.
6. Missionaries.
7. Clergy and laity.

III.—Inscriptions on churches, public buildings, tombs, monuments, coins, seals, etc.

B.—Unwritten sources of the following character:

I.—Buildings:

1. Churches and baptisteries.
2. Tombs and monuments.
3. Civic edifices.
4. Private dwellings.

II.—Art:

1. Sculpture—images and emblems.
2. Painting and fresco.
3. Mosaics.
4. Ecclesiastical vestments and ornaments.
5. Church furniture and vessels.

III.—Rites and ceremonies.

IV.—Oral traditions.

The secondary sources are those that are compiled from a study of the original sources, or from other secondary works, or from both, as is more likely to be the case. This class of material is very abundant, and varies greatly in character and value because of the striking difference in authorship, style, and purpose. It is always necessary, therefore, carefully to discriminate the wheat from the chaff and to be able easily to recognise the "earmarks" of a reliable authority. Many of the works produced by modern scientific

scholarship are excellent in every respect, and, in many fields of historical study, absolutely indispensable. Secondary sources may be divided as follows:

A.—Written works:
I.—History:
1. General treatises based upon either primary sources, or secondary materials, or both.
2. Encyclopedias and dictionaries.
3. Monographs, essays, and articles.
II.—Fiction:
1. Novels.
2. Poetry.
3. Drama.
B.—Unwritten:
I.—Oral traditions and reports.
II.—Transmitted rites and ceremonies.
III.—Works of art copied from originals

The earliest account of the history of the Christian Church extant is the New Testament. The "Memoirs" of Hegesippus, a converted Jew of the second century, is the first known effort to record the growth of the Church, but all his books are lost.[1] Eusebius, the Greek bishop, called the "Father of Church history," wrote a comprehensive *Ecclesiastical History* to 324. Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, each after his own ideal, continued the narrative of Eusebius. Rufinus translated the work of Eusebius into Latin and continued it to 395, while Epiphanius translated Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret into Latin and brought the record to 518. Theodorus and Evagrius were also continuators of these early works. Sul-

[1] Extracts in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* and in *Ante-Nic. Ch. Fathers* (Chr. Lit. ed.), viii., 762.

picius Severus, a Gallic monk of noble birth, penned a fabulous chronicle of little worth.

The Middle Ages produced little of real value in the field of Church history. The chronicles represent the best output. A few scholars of the Eastern Church, the Byzantine historians, the annalists of the Latin Church, and several specialists like Gregory of Tours and the Venerable Bede, complete the list. The lives of saints, however, abound.

The fierce controversial spirit of the Reformation produced two monumental works. Matthias Flacius, aided by other Protestant scholars, in the *Magdeburg Centuries*, sought to reveal the whole disreputable career of the old Church. This keen voluminous work of the Reformers called forth from the learned Italian, Baronius, a powerful defence of the Roman Church in his *Ecclesiastical Annals*. Bossuet, a Frenchman, in his *Discourse on Universal History*, made a severe attack on Protestantism, while Tillemont, a Gallic nobleman of Jansenist faith, wrote critically and with more moderation. In Germany, Hottinger, Spanheim, and Arnold vindicated the Reformation. Following the earlier age of fierce theological controversy, Semler, Henke, Schmidt, Hume, and Gibbon wrote in a very rationalistic style and spirit.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, German scholars have led the world in their contributions to Church history. The great Mosheim made a pronounced improvement in the writing of Church history and introduced the modern scientific method. He was not alone the most learned theologian of his age in Germany, but was critical in the best sense, honest and impartial. His disciple, Schroeckh, wrote a work of forty-five volumes of considerable value.

Gieseler improved on Mosheim's method and wrote an ideal outline of Church history with full citations to all the known sources. Neander, "a giant in learning, and a saint in piety," gave the world an epoch-making *General History of the Christian Religion and Church* (1825–52). His writings and his ideals have influenced nearly every Church historian since his death, when it was said, "The last of the Church Fathers has gone." Among his immediate pupils are Hagenbach, Kurtz, Guericke, Niedner, and Semisch.

Baur founded the celebrated "Tübingen School" and did some excellent work in the Ante-Nicene period. Strauss, Zeller, Schenkel, Rothe, and Nippold are the most prominent among his followers.

The names of other German historians who have laboured in this domain of knowledge are so numerous that only a few of the most prominent will be mentioned. Chief among the Protestants are Hase, Gfroerer, Ebrard, Herzog, Moeller, Müller, Loofs, Hauck, and Harnack; among the Roman Catholic writers are Stolberg, Katerkamp, Döllinger, Alzog, Pastor, Hefele, Hergenröther and Janssen.

Although British scholarship has not devoted itself so zealously to the writing of Church history, yet some excellent contributions have been made by such men as Pusey, Keble, Newman, Waddington, Milman, Stanley, Stubbs, Robertson, Greenwood, Vaughan, Perry, Lingard, Creighton, Gwatkin, Tozer, Hatch, and Orr.

American interest in the field of Church history is largely the product of the last thirty years. Most conspicuous among the contributors are Smith, Lanson, Shedd, Schaff, Fisher, Sheldon, Dryer, Hurst, Newman, McGiffert, and Henry C. Lea.

At the present time in every Christian country a

corps of well-trained scholars are devoting their lives to nearly every phase of Church history, and the outlook is most gratifying.

The literature on Church history, taken as a whole, is perhaps more voluminous than that on any other phase of history. The use of the sources is, in consequence, at the very outset a problem of selection. It is apparent, therefore, that the following brief lists are not meant to be exhaustive. Only the most valuable collections of original documents, and also the most reliable books of a secondary character are included. Special care has been taken to mention all useful collections of sources in the English language. At the conclusion of each chapter will be found references to the sources on special topics.

THE MOST IMPORTANT COLLECTIONS OF PRIMARY SOURCES ARE:

A.—Official Documents:

I.—In English:

1.—Brett, T., *Collection of the Principal Liturgies.* Lond., 1838.

2.—Fulton, J., *Index Canonum.* N. Y., 1892.

3.—Gee, H., and Hardy, W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* N. Y., 1896.

4.—Hammond, C. E., *Liturgies, Eastern and Western.* Lond., 1878.

5.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* Lond. and N. Y., 1892.

6.—Neale, J. M., *The Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, and St. Basil.* 2 vols. Lond., 1859.

7.—Neale, J. M., and Webb, B., *The Symbolism of*

Churches and Church Ornaments. Lond. and N. Y., 1893.

8.—Ogg, F. A., *Source-Book of Mediæval History.* N. Y., 1908.

9.—Palmer, W., *Origines Liturgicæ.* 2 vols. Lond., 1845.

10.—Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library.* Vol. xxiv. Edinb., 1872.

11.—Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History.* Vol. i. Boston, 1906.

12.—Schaff, P., *The Creeds of Christendom.* 3 vols. N. Y., 1878.

13.—Swainson, C. A., *The Greek Liturgies.* Lond. and N. Y., 1884.

14.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History.* N. Y., 1907.

15.—University of Penn., *Translations and Reprints of Original Sources of European History.* Phil., 1894 to present.

16.—Winer, G. B., *Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of Christendom.* Edinb., 1887

II.—In Foreign Languages:

1.—Councils and Synods:

(1).—Binius, S., *Concilia Generalia et Provincialia Græca et Latina.* 4 vols. Best ed., Cologne, 1606.

(2).—Labbé, P., *Concilia.* 18 vols. Paris, 1671. Carried by others to 1727.

(3).—Hardouin, J., *Conciliorum Collectio.* 12 vols. Paris, 1715.

(4).—Mansi, G. D., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio.* 31 vols. Flor., 1759–98. Most complete collection to 1509. New edition now out.

2.—Bulls, Acts, Briefs, Rescripts, and Regests:

(1).—*Bullæ Diversorum Pontificum a Joanne*

XXII. ad Julium III. ex Bibliotheca Ludovici Gomes. Rome, 1550. This is the oldest collection, but it contains only fifty documents.

(2).—Cherubini made the first comprehensive collection of bulls and briefs from Leo I. to 1585. It is known as the *Magnum Bullarium Romanum.*

(3).—Maynardus, *Bullarium Magnum.* 19 vols. Luxemb., 1739–68. Contains bulls from Leo I. to Benedict XIV.

(4).—Coquelines made a similar collection at Rome in 14 vols., 1733–48. Barbarini added 6 more vols. Rome, 1835.

(5).—Tomassetti has made the latest collection of bulls from Leo I. to the nineteenth century. 25 vols. Turin, 1857–72.

(6).—The best collections of early papal briefs were made by Coustant, Paris, 1721; Schoenemann, Götting., 1796; Thiel, Braunsberg, 1867–8.

(7).—Jaffé, P., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (to 1198). Ber., 1881–88. 2 vols.

(8).—Potthast, A., *Regesta Pontificum.* (1198 to 1304). Ber., 1873. 2 vols.

(9).—Kehr, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (to 1198). Berlin, 1906–7. 2 vols.

(10).—The *Liber Pontificalis* gives the history of the popes down to the end of the ninth century. Duchesne's ed. the most complete. Rome, 1886–92. Mommsen's ed. excellent.

(11).—Mirbt, C., *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsthums.* 2d ed., 1903.

3.—Creeds, Liturgies, and Hymns:

(1).—Walch, C. W. F., *Bibliotheca Symbolum Vetus.* Lemgo., 1770.

(2).—Niemeyer, A. H., *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum.* Leipz., 1840

(3).—Kimmel, E. J., *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis.* Jena, 1843–50. 2 vols.

(4).—Heurtley, C. A., *Harmonia Symbolica.* Oxf., 1858.

(5).—Denzinger, H. J. D., *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum.* Wurzb., 1888. 6th ed.

(6).—Caspari, C. P., *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel.* Christiania, 1866–75. 3 vols. Revised in 1879.

(7).—Hahn, A., *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln.* Berlin, 1877. 2d ed.

(8).—Durandus, W., *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum.* (About 1290). Many eds. Last at Naples, 1866.

(10).—Renaudot, E., *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.* New ed., Paris, 1847. 2 vols.

(11).—Muratori, L. A., *Liturgia Romana Vetus.* Venice, 1748.

(12).—Assemani, J. A., *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universæ.* Rome, 1749–66. 13 vols.

(13).—Weale, W. J. H., *Bibliotheca Liturgica.* Lond., 1886.

(14).—Delisle, L., *Mémoire sur d'anciens Sacramentaires.* Paris, 1886.

4.—Laws and Canons:

(1).—Richter, L. A., *Corpus Juris Canonici.* Leipz., 1833. 2 vols.

(2).—Friedberg, E., *Corpus Juris Canonici.* Leipz., 1876–82. Best ed.

(3).—Migne, *Patrologia Latina.* Contains many ancient laws.

(4).—Haenel, *Theodosian Code.* Bonn, 1842. 6 vols.

(5).—Krueger, *Justinian Code.* Ber., 1877.
(6).—Moser, J. J., *Corpus Juris Evang. Ecclesiæ.* Zur., 1737. 2 vols.

5.—Decrees and Acts of Civic Authorities:
(1).—Pertz, et al., *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.* Ber., 1819 to present.
(2).—Muratori, *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum.* Milan, 1723–57. 25 vols. From 500 to 1500.
(3).—*Thesaurus Veterum Inscriptionum.* Milan, 1739–42. 4 vols.
(4).—*Corpus Juris Civilis.* Good ed. by Kriegel Brothers, Leipz., 1833–40. Best ed. by Mommsen, Ber., 1895. 3 vols.

B.—Private Writings of Contemporaries:
I.—In English:
1.—Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library.* 25 vols. Edinb., 1864–72, 1897.
2.—Coxe, A. C., *Ante-Nicene Fathers.* 10 vols. Buf., 1886–88.
3.—Pusey, et al., *A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church.* 48 vols. Oxf., 1839–85.
4.—*The Publications of the Parker Society.* 53 vols. Camb., 1840–55. For English Church.
5.—Schaff, et al., *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.* 14 vols. Buf., 1886–90. First series.
6.—Schaff and Wace, *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.* 14 vols. Lond. and N. Y., 1890–94.
7.—Bohn, *Antiquarian Library.* 36 vols. Lond., 1847, etc.
Classical Library. 107 vols. Lond., 1848, etc.
Ecclesiastical Library. 15 vols. Lond., 1851, etc.
8.—Foxe, *Acts and Monuments.* Townsend ed. Lond., 1843.

9.—Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers.* Lond., 1889.

II.—In Foreign Languages:

1.—Canisius, H., *Antiquæ Lectiones.* 2d ed., 1725. 7 vols.

2.—Combefis, F., *Græco-Lat. Patrum Bibliotheca Auctarium Novum.* 2 vols. Paris, 1648.
Bibliotheca Græcorum Patrum Auctarium Novissimum. 2 vols. Paris, 1672.
Bibliotheca Patrum Concoinatoria. 8 vols. New ed. Paris, 1859.

3.—D'Achery, J. L., *Veterum aliquot Scriptorum qui in Galliæ Bibliothecis delituerant, maxime Benedictinorum Spicilegium.* 13 vols. Paris, 1655–77. New ed., 1723.

4.—Du Pin, L. E., *Bibliothèque Universelle des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques.* 47 vols. Paris, 1686–1704. Several later editions.

5.—Martène, E., *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Collectio Nova.* Rouen, 1700.

6.—Montfauçon, B. de, *Collectio Nova Patrum et Scriptorum Græcorum.* Paris, 1706. 2 vols.

7.—Muratori, L. A., *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,* Mil., 1723–51. 25 vols. New ed. now being published, ed. by Carducci.

8.—Ceillier, R., *Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques.* New ed., Paris, 1858–69. 16 vols.

9.—Bouquet, M., *Scriptores Rerum Gallicarum et Francilarum.* New ed., Paris, 1869–77. To date 23 vols.

10.—Gallandi, A., *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum Antiquorumque Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.* 14 vols. Venice, 1765–81. 380 authors.

11.—Routh, M. J., *Reliquiæ Sacræ.* 5 vols. Oxf., 2d ed., 1846–1848.

12.—Pertz, et al., *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.* Ber., 1819 to present.

13.—Niebuhr, et al., *Scriptores Historiæ Byzantinæ.* Bonn, 1828–55. 48 vols.

14. Migne, J. P., *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus.* Paris, 1844–66. 222 vols. of Latin Fathers and 166 vols. of Greek Fathers.

15.—Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland from the Roman Invasion to Henry VIII. Lond., 1858–90. 210 vols. (Rolls series).

16.—Academy of Vienna, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Latinæ.* 17 vols. Vienna, 1867–95.

17.—Jaffé, P., *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum.* 1864–73. 6 vols.

18.—Graffin, P., *Patrologia Syriaca.* Paris, 1895. 2 vols.

(19).—*Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.*

(20).—*Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique.* Paris. 1906 *ff.* (To be completed in 60 vols.)

C.—Inscriptions:

I.—In English:

1.—Northcote, J. S., *Epitaphs of the Catacombs.* Lond., 1898.

2.—Bingham, J., *Antiquities of the Christian Church.* Oxf., 1855. 10 vols. Very valuable.

3.—Guericke, H. E. F., *Manual of the Antiquities of the Church.* Lond., 1851.

4.—Bennett, C. W., *Christian Archæology.* N. Y., 1888.

5.—Rushforth, G. McN., *Latin Historical Inscriptions.* Oxf., 1893.

II.—In Latin:

1.—*See Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* Best ed. by Mommsen under Berlin Academy. 1862 to date 11 vols.

2.—Boeckh, P. A., *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum.* Ber., 1824.

3.—Le Blant, E., *Inscriptions chrét. de la Gaule.* Paris, 1856–65. 2 vols.

4.—Hübner, E., *Inscriptiones Hispan. Christ.* Ber., 1871.

Inscrip. Brit. Christ. Ber., 1876.

5.—De Rossi, J. B., *Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ Septimo Sæculo Antiquiores.* Rome, 1861.

6.—Fabretti, A., *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum.* Turin, 1867–77. 2 vols. Three supplements. Flor., 1800.

7.—*L'Epigraphie Chrestienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique.* Paris, 1890.

Most Important General Church Historians:

A.—Before the Reformation:

I.—Greek:

1.—Hegesippus, a Christian Jew in Asia Minor (2d cent.), wrote a Church history in five books. Based on traditions. Only fragments preserved. See *Ante-Nic. Lib.*, viii., 762–5. See Eusebius.

2.—Eusebius (d. 340), "Father of Church History," wrote a history of Church to 324. Valuable storehouse. Various Eng. translations. That by McGiffert, N. Y., 1890, in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, i., is the best.

3.—Socrates (d. 408), a lawyer, continued Eusebius to 439. Bohn. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, ii.

4.—Sozomen (d. 400), a lawyer, continued Eusebius to 423. *Ibid.* Bohn.

5.—Theodoret (d. 457), a bishop, aimed to complete Socrates and Sozomen. *Ibid.* Bohn.

6.—Evagrius (d. 537), a lawyer, continued Theodoret. Bohn. Bagster, *Eccles. Historians.*

For other Greek historians, lost or not in English, see Alzog, i., § 17; Schaff i., 29.

II.—Latin—to the Reformation:

1.—Rufinus (b. 345), a priest, translated Eusebius and added an inaccurate history of the Arians (318–395). Preface only in Eng. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, iii., 565.

2.—Severus (b. 363), a Gallic priest, wrote the history of the world to 400. Good for Gaul. *Ib.*, xi., 71–122.

3.—Orosius (5th cent.), a Spanish priest, wrote a world history to 416. Used as a text-book in Middle Ages. Bohn.

4.—Cassiodorus (d. 562), a statesman and abbot, compiled a Church history from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. This is the famous "Tripartite History." It served as a text-book throughout the Middle Ages. Not in Eng. See Migne, *Patrologia*, lxix., and Hodgkin, *The Letters of Cassiodorus.*

5.—Gregory of Tours (d. 594), a bishop, wrote a valuable history of the Frankish Church. Not in Eng.

6.—Venerable Bede (d. 735), "Father of English Church History," wrote a history of the English Church to 731. Many Eng. eds.

7.—Paul Warnefried (d. 799), a Lombard monk wrote a History of the Langobords. Tr. by Foulke, U. of Pa. *Transl and Rep.* Phil. 1907.

8.—Haymo (d. 853), bishop of Halderstadt, abridged Rufinus and added notes of his own. Not in Eng.

9.—Anastasius (d. 886), abbot and papal librarian at Rome, compiled a Church history from the Greek writers. Not in Eng.

10.—Flodoard (d. 966), a bishop, wrote a history of the Church of Rheims to 948. Not in Eng.

11.—Luitprand (d. 972), bishop of Cremona, wrote a chronicle and a report of his embassy to Constantinople. See Pertz, *Mon. Ger.*, iii., 264; Henderson, *Hist. Docs. of the M. A.*, 441.

12.—Adam of Bremen (d. 1076), a canon, wrote the only reliable history of the Scandinavian Church from 788 to 1076. Not in Eng.

13.—Orderic Vital (d. 1142), abbot in Normandy, wrote a Church history to 1142. Best work of the Middle Ages. In Eng., Bohn. Vols. 27, 28, 30, 36.

14.—Ptolemy of Lucca (d. 1312), a Dominican, and papal librarian, wrote a Church history to 1312. Not in Eng.

15.—St. Antoninus (d. 1459), archbishop of Florence, wrote the largest mediæval work from the creation to 1457. Not in Eng.

16.—Laurentius Valla (d. 1457), an Italian critic and scholar, wrote a history of the Church. Denounced the "Donation of Constantine" as a forgery. Work full of doubt. Not in Eng.

17.—Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464), a cardinal, was a radical critic in his early days but temperate in later life. His works not in Eng.

18.—John of Tritenheim (d. 1516) was among the first historians to write from the sources. Not in Eng.

19.—Albert Cranz (d. 1517), a canon of Hamburg, wrote "The Metropolis," a critical history of the Church in northern Germany from 780 to 1504. Not in Eng.

B.—Roman Catholic historians after the Reformation:

I.—Italian:

1.—Baronius (d. 1607), a cardinal, wrote *Annales Ecclesiastici* in 12 fol. vols. The work of 30 years. Invaluable. Not in Eng. Written to refute the Protestant *Magdeburg Centuries*. Continued from 1198 to 1566 by Raynaldus, to 1571 by Laderchi, to 1584 by Theiner. Pagi made valuable corrections. Best defence of the mediæval papacy.

2.—Caspar Saccarelli wrote *Historia Ecclesiastica* to 1185. Pub. in Rome, 1771–96, in 25 quarto vols.

3.—Muratori (d. 1750) made a valuable collection of Italian historians and original documents from 500 to 1500. Not in Eng.

4.—Mansi (d. 1769) edited a valuable and very complete edition of the councils. Not in Eng.

5.—Orsi (1761), a Dominican cardinal, wrote a Church history for the first six centuries. Continued by others to the Council of Trent. Not in Eng.

For other Italian historians see Alzog, i., 49.

II.—French:

1.—Natalis Alexander (d. 1724) wrote a clear, deep Church history to 1600. Its Gallican spirit put it in the Index till corrected.

2.—Abbé Fleury (d. 1723) wrote a Church history to 1414 in 20 vols. from the sources. Continued to 1595 by Fabre. First 3 vols. pub. in Eng. at Oxf., in 1842.

3.—Bossuet (d. 1704), the bishop of Meaux, wrote a "*Discourse on Universal History*. In Eng. Continued by Cramer, a German Protestant.

4.—Tillemont (d. 1698), a nobleman and priest, wrote fine biographies to 516 from the sources. An excellent piece of work in 16 vols.

5.—Du Pin (d. 1719) furnished a biographical and bibliographical Church history to the 17th century.

6.—Ceillier (d. 1763) wrote a similar work but more complete and valuable.

7.—Darras (d. 1872). *A General History of the Catholic Church.* Transl. by Spaulding. 4 vols. Not reliable.

III.—German:

1.—Count Leopold von Stolberg (d. 1819), an ex-Protestant, wrote a Church history to 430 in 15 vols. Kerz continued it in 30 more vols. to 1192 and Brischar in 9 more vols. to 1245.

2.—Theodore Katerkamp (d. 1834), a professor at Munster, and a friend of Stolberg, wrote a history to 1153.

3.—Locherer (d. 1837), a professor at Giessen, produced a very liberal work up to 1073.

4.—Döllinger (d. 1890), a professor in Munich, was the most learned historian of the Catholic Church in the 19th cent. Was excommunicated for refusing to accept the Vatican decrees (1871). Most of his many works have been translated into Eng.

5.—Hefele (d. 1893), a professor at Tübingen and a bishop, wrote *History of the Councils* to 1447. An excellent piece of work. Completed by Hergenröther. In Eng.

6.—Gfrörer (d. 1861) began his learned Church history as a rationalist (1841) and continued it from 1056 on as a Catholic.

7.—Hergenröther (d. 1890), cardinal and keeper of the papal archives at Rome, wrote a general history of the Church which is very partisan.

IV.—English and American:

1.—Newman (d. 1890), an English cardinal, wrote

The Arians of the Fourth Century (1883), *Church of the Fathers*, and many other historical works.

2.—Allies, *The Formation of Christendom.* Lond., 1882–91. 7 vols.

3.—Spalding (1872), an American prelate, wrote *The History of the Protestant Reformation*, 2 vols., 1860, and edited Darras's *General History of the Catholic Church.* (1868.)

4.—Gibbons (b. 1834), cardinal in the U. S., wrote *Faith of Our Fathers* and other historical works.

C.—Protestant Church Historians:

I.—German:

1.—Matthias Flacius Illyricus (d. 1575), with ten educated Protestant scholars, produced the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, covering 13 centuries in 13 vols., to justify the Reformation. Controversial.

2.—Hottinger (d. 1664) wrote a partisan history to 16th cent. in 9 vols. Not original.

3.—Spanheim (d. 1649) worked out a history from the sources to 16th cent. Aimed at Baronius. Eng. transl.

4.—Arnold, (d. 1714) wrote an *Impartial History of the Church and of Heretics* to 1688. "Learned, but fanatical."

5.—Mosheim (d. 1755) wrote *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History.* Marks an epoch in the writing of Church history. Several Eng. transls.

6.—Schröckh (d. 1808) wrote large work in 45 vols. on epoch plan, to end of 18th cent. Rich in historical material.

7.—Henke (d. 1809) wrote a general history in a very rationalistic style.

8.—Neander (d. 1850), professor in Berlin, the "Father of Modern Church History," wrote

A General History of the Christian Religion and Church to 1430. Based on the sources. Several Eng. transls. Torrey's the best.

9.—Gieseler (d. 1854), professor in Göttingen, wrote a history from the sources to 1648. Various Eng. transls. Excellent.

10.—Baur (d. 1860). professor in Tübingen, produced a *History of the Christian Church* in 5 vols. In Eng.

11.—Hagenbach (d. 1874), professor in Basle, wrote a general history of the Church in 7 vols. In Eng.

II.—French:

1.—Chastel (d. 1886), professor at Geneva, wrote a complete history of the Church in 5 vols.

2.—D'Aubigné (d. 1872), professor at Geneva, wrote a general history of the Reformation in 13 vols. In Eng.

3.—Renan, E. (d. 1892), was educated for the Catholic priesthood, but he early gave up that calling and devoted himself to history and literature. He produced many works of great value on early Church history.

III.—English:

1.—Gibbon (d. 1794) devoted twenty years to his history of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* To 1453. Still very valuable. Best ed. by Bury Lond., 1896.

2.—Milner (d. 1797) wrote a *History of the Church of Christ* in popular form.

3.—Dean Waddington (d. 1869) penned six "high and dry" vols. on the Church.

4.—Robertson (d. 1882), professor in King's College, London, wrote a *History of the Christian Church* to 1517. Fairly well done from the sources.

5.—Milman (d. 1868), among other works, wrote

the *History of Latin Christianity* to 1455 in 8 vols. Excellent.

6.—Dean Stanley (d. 1881) has given us histories of the Eastern Church and Jewish Church in a pure, plain style.

7.—Creighton (d. 1901), has written the best *History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome.* 6 vols. Invaluable.

IV.—American:

1.—Smith (d. 1877), professor in Union Theological Seminary, worked out the history of Christianity in 16 chronological tables, (1860).

2.—Shedd, (d. 1894), professor in Union Theological Seminary, wrote a *History of Christian Doctrine* in 2 vols. 1863.

3.—Schaff (d. 1893), professor in Union Theological Seminary, a disciple of Neander, wrote, in addition to other works of value, a *History of the Christian Church.* To the Reformation. 7 vols. Excellent. Vol. 5, by D. S. Schaff.

4.—Sheldon (b. 1845) has written an excellent history of doctrine and also of the Church. 5 vols. 1896.

5.—Allen (d. 1908) wrote *Christian History in Three Great Decades* in 3 vols. 1883.

6.—Fisher (b. 1827), professor in Yale, has produced several valuable books on Church history.

7.—White (d. 1885) wrote *Eighteen Christian Centuries.*

8.—Lea (b. 1825) has written invaluable monographs on the *Inquisition, Indulgences, Celibacy,* etc., which have given him a world-wide reputation.

9.—Other Americans who are doing good work in Church history are: Jackson, Hurst, Baird, Thompson, Mombert, Gillett, Storrs, Taylor,

Clark, Emerton, Bigelow, West, Fulton, Jacobs, Newman, Zenos, Dexter, McGiffert, Dryer, Faulkner, etc.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

A.—English:

I.—Protestant:

1.—Abbott and Conant, *Dictionary of Religious Knowledge.* N. Y., 1875.

2.—Benham, *Dictionary of Religion.* Lond. and N. Y., 1887.

3.—Blunt, *A Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology.* Lond. and Phil., 2d ed., 1891.

4.—Blunt, *A Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought.* Lond. and Phil., 2d ed., 1886.

5.—Buck, *A Theological Dictionary.* Lond., 1847.

6.—Cheyne and Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica.* 4 vols. N. Y., 1905.

7.—Eadie, *The Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia.* Lond., 1847.

8.—*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.* Phil., 1870.

9.—Farrar, *An Ecclesiastical Dictionary.* Lond., 1853.

10.—Gardner, *The Christian Cyclopedia.* Lond., 1854.

11.—Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible.* N. Y. and Edinburgh.

12.—Herzog, *A Protestant, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia.* 2 vols. Phil., 1858–60.

13.—Hook, *A Church Dictionary.* N. Y., 1875.

14.—Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography.* 4 vols. Lond., 1845.

15.—Jackson, *Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer.* N. Y., 1893.

16.—McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.* 10 vols. N. Y., 1867–81. 2 sup. vols. 1884–86.

17.—Marsden, *A Dictionary of Christian Churches and Sects.* 2 vols. Lond., 1891.

18.—Sanford, *A Concise Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.* N. Y., 1891.

19.—Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.* 3 vols. N. Y., 1891.
The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge. Revised by S. M. Jackson. N. Y. and Lond., 1908 *ff.* In 12 vols.

20.—Shipley, *A Glossary of Ecclesiastical Forms.* Lond., 1871.

21.—Smith and Cheetham, *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.* 2 vols. Bost., 1875–80.

22.—Smith and Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines.* 4 vols. Bost., 1877–87.

23.—Stanton, *An Ecclesiastical Dictionary.* N. Y., 1861.

24.—Wolcott, *Sacred Archeology.* Lond., 1868.

II.—Catholic:

1.—Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary.* N. Y., 1884.

2.—Gillow, *Dictionary of English Catholic Biography and Bibliography.* (1534–1884.) 6 vols. Lond., 1887–94.

3.—Gibbings, *Index Expurgatoris.* Lond., 1837.

4.—Butler, *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Saints.* 12 vols. Lond., 1866.

5.—Berington, *The Faith of Catholics.* 3 vols. Lond., 1846.

6.—*The Catholic Encyclopedia.* N. Y., 1907 ff. (To be completed in 15 vols.)

7.—Thein, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, 1905.

III.—Jewish and Mohammedan:

1.—*The Jewish Encyclopedia.* 12 vols. N. Y., 1902–5.

2.—*Encyclopedia Islam.* 3 vols. 1908.

B.—Foreign:

I.—Protestant:

1.—Hauck, *Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.* 1896 ff.

2.—Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses.* Paris, 1872–82. 13 vols.

II.—Catholic:

1.—Aschbach, *Allgemeines Kirchen-Lexicon.* Frankf., 1846–50. 4 vols.

2.—Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lexicon.* Freib., 1847–56. 12 vols.

3.—Hergenröther und Kauler. *Kirchenlexikon oder Encyklopädie der Katholischen Theologie und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften.* Freib., 1880–1895. 10 vols.

C.—Consult standard secular encyclopædias like Britannica, Johnson, International, etc.

Atlases and Chronologies

I.—English:

1.—Koeppen, A. L., *The World in the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1854.

2.—Sprüner, *Historico-Geographical Hand Atlas.* Lond., 1861.

3.—Wiltsch, J. E. F., *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church.* 2 vols. Lond., 1859–69.

4.—McClure, C. E., *Ecclesiastical Atlas.* Lond., 1888.

5.—Freeman, E. A., *Historical Geography of Europe.* Lond., 1881. 2 vols. New ed. 1904.

6.—Labberton, R. H., *New Historical Atlas and General History.* N. Y., 1890.

7.—Riddle, J. E., *Ecclesiastical Chronology.* Lond., 1840.

8.—Tarner, G. E., *Concise Tabular View of the Outlines of Christian History.* Lond., 1890.

9.—Smith, H. B., *History of the Church in Chronological Tables.* N. Y., 1875.

10.—Woodward and Cates, *Encyclopædia of Chronology.* N. Y., 1872.

11.—Dow, E. W., *Atlas of European History.* N. Y., 1907.

II.—Foreign:

1.—Putzger, F. W., *Historischer Schul-Atlas.* Leipz., 1903. Anglicised now. Excellent.

2.—Droysen, H., *Allgemeine historische Handatlas.* Leipz., 1886.

3.—Weidenbach, *Calendarium Hist. Chron. Medii et Novi Ævi.* Reg., 1855.

4.—Grotefend, G. A., *Handbuch des Hist. Chr. des Mittel-Alters.* Hanov., 1872.

Text-books on Church History

I.—Protestant:

1.—Allen, *Outlines of Christian History.* Bost., 1885. 3 vols.

2.—Blackburn, *History of the Christian Church.* Cin., 1879. (Presb.).

3.—Butler, *An Ecclesiastical History.* Phil., 1868–72. 2 vols.

4.—Fisher, *History of the Christian Church.* N. Y., 1887.

5.—Foulkes, *A Manual of Ecclesiastical History.* Oxf., 1851.

6.—Gieseler, *A Text-Book of Church History.* N. Y., 1868–79. 5 vols.

7.—Green, *Handbook of Church History*. N. Y., 1904.
8.—Guericke, *A Manual of Church History* (to 1073). And., 1872. 2 vols.
9.—Hardwick, *A History of the Christian Church*. Lond., 1861–65. 2 vols.
10.—Hase, *A History of the Christian Church*. N. Y., 1870.
11.—Hurst, *A History of the Christian Church*. N. Y., 1897. 2 vols.
12.—Jennings, *A Manual of Church History*. N. Y., 1887–8. 2 vols.
13.—Knight, *A Concise History of the Church*. Lond., 1888.
14.—Kurtz, *Church History*. N. Y., 1888. 3 vols.
15.—Moeller, *History of the Christian Church*. Lond., 1902. 3 vols.
16.—Moncrief, *A Short History of the Christian Church*. Chicago and N. Y., 1902.
17.—Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*. Last ed., Bost., 1902. 3 vols.
18.—Newman, *A Manual of Church History*. Phil., 1902–3. 2 vols.
19.—Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*. N. Y., 1884–92. 7 vols.
Vol. v., by D. S. Schaff, N. Y., 1908.
20.—Smith, *The Student's Manual of Ecclesiastical History*. N. Y., 1879.
21.—Schubert, *Outlines of Church History*. Lond., 1907.
22.—Sohm, *Outlines of Church History*. Lond., 1895.
23.—Waddington, *A History of the Church*. Lond., 1835. 3 vols.
24.—Zenos, *Compendium of Church History*. Phil., 1900.

II.—Catholic:

1.—Alzog, *A Manual of Universal Church History.* Lond., 1888–90. 3 vols.

2.—Birkheuser, *History of the Catholic Church from its First Establishment to our own Times.* 7th ed., 1905.

3.—Brueck, *History of the Catholic Church.* N.Y., 1886.

4.—Döllinger, *Manual of Church History.* Lond., 1840–42. 4 vols.

5.—Gilmartin, *Manual of Church History.* Lond., 1890–2. 2 vols.

It is a matter of deep regret that such excellent books by Catholic writers like Hergenröther, Kraus, Möhler, Funk, etc., have not yet been translated into English.

Sources

1.—Adams, C. K., *A Manual of Historical Literature.* N. Y., 1888.

2.—Cave, A., *Introduction to Theology.* Edinb., 1886.

3.—Crooks, G. R., and Hurst, J. F., *Literature of Theology.* N. Y., 1896. Pt. iii.

4.—Darling, J., *Cyclopædia Bibliographica.* 3 vols. Lond., 1854–9.

5.—Donaldson, J., *A Critical History of Christian Literature.* 3 vols. Lond., 1864–6.

6.—Dowling, J. G., *An Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History.* London, 1832.

7.—Fisher, J. A., *A Select Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History.* Bost., 1885.

8.—Fortescue, G. K., *Subject Index of the Modern Works Added to the Library of the British Museum in the Years 1881–1900.* 3 vols. 1902–1904.

9.—Hurst, J. F., *Literature of Theology.* N. Y., 1896. Pt. iii., p. 186.

10.—Krüger, G., *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries.* N. Y., 1897.

11.—Malcom, H., *Theological Index.* Phil., 1870.

12.—Poole, W. F., *Index to Periodical Literature* (1802 to date).

13.—Schaff, P., *Theological Propædeutics.* N. Y., 1893.
14. Sonnenschein, W. S., *The Best Books.* Lond., 1896.
15.—Tibbals, C. F., *Thesaurus of the Best Theological, Historical, and Biographical Literature.* N. Y., 1891.

CHAPTER III

PREPARATION OF THE CIVILISED WORLD FOR THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

OUTLINE: I.—The ancient world. II.—Condition of the civilised world at the time Jesus came. III.—How the condition of the world prepared the way for Christianity. IV.—Sources.

THE ancient world included the many independent tribes surrounding the Mediterranean Sea and spreading into the interior. This independence was institutional. Each tribe had its own government. laws, and customs; its own religion and gods; its own ideals of education; its own commercial and industrial methods. But all these diversities of life and thought were broken down by the ascendancy of Rome. The independent laws, gods, and institutions fell before the onward march of those of the Mistress of the World.

When Jesus was born, the Roman Empire extended from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, and from the African desert to the Danube, Rhine, and Weser. It formed a wide fringe around the Mediterranean Sea, included the best parts of three continents, and had a population of 100,000,000.[1] The Empire was called "the world." Roman law was predominant throughout the provinces as well as at Rome, but local usages were tolerated. Citizenship had become so widely

[1] Mommsen, v., chs. 11–12; Merivale, i., ch. 1.; iv., ch. 39; Liddell, ii., ch. 71; Bury's Gibbon, i., chs. 1–3; Finlay, i., ch. 1.

extended that the different peoples began to feel themselves a single race, bound together by one Emperor, one government, and one code of laws.

The era of the boyhood of Jesus was one of comparative peace, since there was no important war after the naval battle of Actium (31 B.C.).[1] Hence the industries of the Empire prospered greatly. Across the Mediterranean as the great highway, up and down the rivers, and along the incomparable Roman roads, an enormous trade was carried on between the colonies and the capital, Rome.[2] Factories thrived in every direction and commerce flourished. Showers of wealth fairly fell upon the Eternal City.

The trade of the Empire was carried on in Latin, the official language of the Empire for law and war. Greek was also a universal tongue, but used more especially for art, science, philosophy, education, and religion.[3] Cicero complained: "Greek is read in almost all nations. Latin is confined by its own natural boundaries." Hebrew and other tongues were sectional. The literature of the opening century of the Christian era, however, was largely in Latin,[4] which had been fertilised by Greek culture.

Education had made far greater progress in this old world than is generally thought. Judea,[5] Greece,[6]

[1] 1 Tim. ii., 2. Epictetus wrote: "Cæsar has promised us a profound peace; there are neither wars, nor battles, nor great robberies, nor piracy."—*Dis.*, iii., 13.

[2] Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* Lond., 1878. Bergier, *Histoire des Grands Chemins de l'Empire Romain.*

[3] Merivale, iv., ch. 41.

[4] The chief writers were: Ovid, d. 17; Livy, d. 17; Lucan, d. 65; Seneca, d. 65; Pliny, d. 115; Tacitus, d. 119; Juvenal, d. 130.

[5] Schürer, ii., § 22; Graetz, i., ch. 20.

[6] Plato, *Protagoras*, tr. by Jowett; Aristotle, *Politics*, bk. 8, tr. by Jowett; Mahaffy, *Old Greek Ed.*; St. John, *The Hellenes*,

and Rome[1] had excellent systems of education, though differing much in purpose and in subjects studied. Pronounced schools of philosophy grew up. Art, comparatively little developed among the Jews, culminated with the Greeks, and from them was transplanted to Rome. Travel, always liberalising and educational, was widespread among scholars, tradesmen, soldiers, and public officials. All these factors had produced a superior intelligence and general culture throughout the Empire.

The religious condition of the Empire was very significant. The Roman religion, a mixture of Grecian and Etrurian religions[2]—of licentiousness and puritanism—was alone legal over the whole Empire.[3] The Emperor, as Pontifex Maximus, was head of the religion. Worship, however, had become mere form—even priests ridiculed the gods. Cicero declared: "One soothsayer could not look another in the face without laughing," and "even old women would no longer believe either in the fables of Tartarus or the joys of Elysium." This loss of faith engendered skepticism and superstition, and gave magicians and necromancers a wide patronage. The best men in Rome were demanding reformation, and were longing for and predicting a new era. Cicero prophesied: "There shall no longer be one law at Rome, and another at Athens; nor shall it decree one thing to-day, and an-

bk. 2, ch. 4; Davidson, *Aristotle*, bk. 1., ch. 4; *The Nation*, March 24, 1892, pp. 230–231; Zeller, *Socrates and the Socratic Schools*, ch. 3; Capes, *University Life in Ancient Athens*, ch. 1.; Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ch. 4.; Thirlwell, *Hist. of Greece*, i., ch. 8.

[1] Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, ii., 294–296; Kirkpatrick, *Hist. Develop. of Super. Instr.*; *Am. Jour. of Ed.*, xxiv., 468–470.

[2] Gieseler, i., §11.

[3] Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, i., bk. 7.

other to-morrow; but one and the same law, eternal and immutable, shall be prescribed for all nations and all times, and the God who shall prescribe, introduce, and promulgate this law shall be the one common Lord and Supreme Ruler of all."[1]

The Grecian religion,[2] so closely resembling the Roman, was of course tolerated in the Empire. The gods were ideal Greeks with virtues and vices magnified. They were born, had passions, senses, and bodies like men, but never died. They committed crimes, had troubles, and were given to wrath, hatred, lust, cruelty, perjury, deception, and adultery, yet were omnipotent and omniscent.[3] While the conception of Zeus, as the father of the gods, ruled by fate, had a vague idea of monotheism in it, still the Greek religion lacked the Christian conception of sin and righteousness, for with the Greeks sin was only a folly of the understanding—even the gods sinned. Small wonder then that Plato banished the gods from his ideal republic.[4] Pindar, Eschylus, and Sophocles also urged loftier views of the gods, and preached a higher morality.[5] With the Roman conquest national honour and patriotism died out, and superstition, infidelity,

[1] *About the Republic*, iii., 6; Virgil, *Eclogues*, iv., 4–10; 13, 14; Lactantius, *Divine Inst.*, vi., 8; Suetonius, *Life of Vesp.*, ch. 4; Tacitus, *Histories*, v., 13.

[2] Gladstone, *Gods and Men of the Heroic Age;* Tyler, *Theol. of the Greeks;* Cocker, *Christ and Greek Philos.;* Niebuhr, *Stories of Gr. Heroes;* Berens, *Myths and Legends of Anc. Gr.;* Taylor, *Anc. Ideals;* Farnell, *Cults of the Gr. States;* Ely, *Olympus;* Francillon, *Gods and Heroes;* Grote; Curtius; Thirlwell.

[3] Read *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and Hesiod; *Theogeny.*

[4] *Concerning the Republic*, ii.

[5] Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece.* Edinb., 1908. Baur, *The Christian Element in Plato*, Edinb., 1861; Hatch, *The, Greek Influence on Christianity;* Hibbert Lectures, 1888.

refined materialism, and outright atheism came in. The best hearts were longing for a new and purer religion, and were ready to accept it when it came.

The Jews,[1] intensely religious, with several thousand years of spiritual history back of them, divided the known world into the followers of the true God and the heathen idolaters. Even they were separated into factions:

(1) The Pharisees,[2] numbering 6000, stoical casuists, rigidly orthodox, prone to analyse the Mosaic law to death, intensely patriotic, and bitter against all non-Jewish tendencies, were very popular, guided public worship, and controlled the Jews in politics.

(2) The Sadducees,[3] rationalistic and skeptical, were aristocratic Epicureans who rejected oral traditions, and denied resurrection,[4] angels,[5] and an all-ruling, foreknowing Providence. They formed a smaller political party in opposition to the Pharisees, held many priestly offices, were in league with the Romans, and therefore had less influence with the people.[6]

(3) The Essenes,[7] a mystic brotherhood of 4000 whose purpose was to attain holiness, received their

[1] Schürer, *Hist of Jewish People;* Milman, *Hist of the Jews;* Stanley *Lect. on Hist. of Jewish Ch.;* Ewald, *Hist. of Jewish People;* Edersheim, *Prophecy and Hist. in Rel. to the Messiah;* Kent, *Hist. of Heb. People;* Graetz, *Hist. of Jews;* Newman, *Christianity in its Cradle.* See Josephus for full account.

[2] *Jewish Encyc.* See Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIII., x., 5, 6; v., 9; XVII., ii., 4; XVIII., i., 2.

[3] *Jewish Encyc.* See Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIII., v., 9; x., 6; XVIII., i., 3; *Wars*, II., viii., 14.

[4] Matt. xxii., 23; Mark xii., 18; Luke xx., 27; Josephus, *Antiq.*, xviii., 1, 4.

[5] Acts xxiii., 8.

[6] It must be remembered that Nicodemus, Gamaliel, and others came from this class.

[7] *Jewish Encyc.*

ideas from eastern Theosophists; lived communal lives on the shores of the Dead Sea; took the Old Testament allegorically; wore a white dress; were overscrupulously clean for the purpose of purification; and rejected animal food, bloody sacrifices, oaths, slavery, and marriage. They had little to do with politics; were forerunners of Christian monasticism; and may have influenced the ideas of Jesus.[1]

(4) The Samaritans,[2] in origin half Jewish and half heathen Babylonian, practised their reformed Judaism about Gerizim under an established Levitical priesthood. They rejected all Scriptures but the Pentateuch, held pure Messianic expectations, looked with favour upon Christianity, and were bitterly hated by the orthodox Jews.[3]

(5) The Zealots, led by Judas of Galilee, a sort of a nationalistic party, were imbued by a very materialistic conception of the hope of Israel. They sprang from the Pharisees and followed them in religious things. They confidently expected the realisation of the kingdom of God, the Messiah, and a new Israel. In their patriotic zeal they did not hesitate to use the sword and dagger to drive out their Roman foes in order to realise their dreams for a purely Jewish kingdom. Their followers came mostly from the lowest classes.[4]

(6) The common people accepted the Pharisees, in a general way, as leaders. They believed in tradition and in the resurrection, but they were prone to

[1] Josephus; Philo; Pliny; Lightfoot, *Ep. to Gal.;* Schürer, ii., 188; *Jewish Encyc.*

[2] *Jewish Encyc.*

[3] John iv., 4, viii., 48; Luke ix., 52, 53; x., 25–37.

[4] Josephus, *Antiq.*, xviii., i., 1–6; Rhees, *Life of Jesus; Jewish Encyc.;* Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible.*

neglect the law and formalism so stoutly insisted upon by the scribes. This class of Jews had a vital, living fellowship with God, and might be called pietists. Such characters as Simeon and Anna, Zachariah and Elizabeth, Joseph and Mary, and most of those influenced by John's call to repentance were of this class. They stood for the pure religion of the early prophets, and in a way opposed the sacerdotalism of the Jewish Church. They were in a spiritual and ethical mood to accept the great teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and were consequently his first converts. While they constituted the majority of the Jews, and were scattered all over the Roman Empire yet they were not organised as a political party. To these Christianity meant a great and much needed reformation.[1]

The moral condition of the Empire, east and west, makes a dark picture as drawn by such men as Paul,[2] Seneca,[3] Tacitus,[4] Juvenal, Persius, and Sallust. "The world is full of crimes and vices" moaned Seneca. Foreign conquest and plunder brought in their wake luxury, sensuality, cruelty, and licentiousness. Slavery was fostered; infanticide tolerated; marriage lax, and divorce shamefully common. Amusements became bloody and brutal; 20,000 lives were sacrificed in one month to appease the populace, who cared only for "panem et circenses." The stern virtue and morality of old Greece and Rome were dead. The huge

[1] Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. II., ii., 154–187; Wendt, *Teachings of Jesus*, i., 33–89; Graetz, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii., 122–123, 140–147; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i., 160–179; Rhees, *Life of Jesus*, sec. 13; Mathews, *Hist. of N. T. Times*, ch. 13.

[2] Rom. i., 18–32.

[3] *De Ira*, I., ii., c. 8.

[4] *Politica*, I., ii., c. 2–18.

Empire was a giant body without a soul going to final destruction.

It is evident, then, that forces both positive and negative were at work to prepare the civilised world for the reception of Christianity:

(1) The universal Empire of Rome was a positive groundwork for the universal empire of the Gospel. The imperial organisation suggested a form of organisation for the Church, so that Latin Christianity was simply Rome baptised. The unity of the Empire afforded concrete illustration of God's spiritual kingdom, and implied fatherhood and brotherhood.[1] Imperial toleration of harmless provincial religions protected Christianity, and thus enabled it to get a foothold before persecution came. Universal peace also was a boon to the Christian crusade.

The flourishing commerce, the good roads uniting the Empire, the extensive travel, and the various military expeditions all made the spread of new ideas easier and quicker.

(2) Pagan theology became a stepping-stone to Christian theology.[2] The decay of polytheism, because of its unspiritual and unsatisfying character, made spiritual monotheism acceptable. Pagan temples, priests, and rites made the conception of, and the transition to, Christianity easier. Even the low

[1] Tacitus felt a common humanity when he wrote: "Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto." Cicero and Virgil expressed like ideas. In the Middle Ages it was even said that Virgil in the Fourth Eclogue prophesied the advent of Jesus. See *Princeton Rev.*, Sept. 1879, 403 *ff.*

[2] Ackerman, *The Christian Element in Plato;* Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy;* Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church;* Addis, *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, 22–25; Farrar, *Seekers after God;* Davidson, *The Stoic Creed*, N. Y. 1907.

moral condition and widespread skepticism strongly emphasised the need of a better religion.

(3) The schools of the Empire prepared men's minds for an intellectual consideration of the new faith, though not necessarily for its adoption. The Greek and Latin tongues were excellent mediums for propagating the new doctrines. Greek particularly was excellent for the expression of abstract and lofty truth, and the Old Testament had been translated into it more than two centuries before Jesus.[1] Grecian eloquence became the model for sacred oratory. The philosophy of Plato and Aristotle formed the scientific basis for Christian theology. The spiritual flights of Plato,[2] the religious reflections of Plutarch, and the moral precepts of Seneca were all used as arguments of revealed religion. Even pagan art, with its love for the beautiful, was early employed to give material expression to Christian ideas.

(4) The Jews, scattered over the world,[3] befriended by Julius Cæsar, given legal status as a sect by Augustus, expelled in vain by Tiberius and Claudius, spread a knowledge of the living God over the whole Empire before Christ appeared. Synagogues were numerous, and many Gentiles became converts to monotheism.[4] These converts were the first to accept the teachings of Jesus, and in this way formed the *nuclei* of the Christian Church.

Thus Jerusalem the Holy City, Athens the city of culture, and Rome the city of power, combined to prepare the world so that the matchless ethical and relig-

[1] The Septuagint version, 284–247 B.C.
[2] Ackerman, *The Christian Element in Plato.*
[3] Josephus and Strabo. Gieseler, i., § 17.
[4] Apion, ii., 10, 39

ious teaching of Jesus of Nazareth could capture the hearts and heads of men, replace the national religions, and become realised in the outward forms and inward beliefs of the Christian Church, which was soon to exercise a controlling power in the civilised world.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

I.—JEWISH:

1.—*Old Testament.*

2.—*Old Testament Apocrypha.* Transl. by E. C. Bissell, N. Y., 1865–80.

3.—Josephus (37–103 A.D.), *Antiquities*, and *The Jewish War.* Various eds. Whiston the standard.

4.—Philo Judæus (20 B.C. – 40 A.D.), *Works.* Transl. by C. D. Yonge. In Bohn, Lond., 1854–5. 4 vols.

5.—*The Talmud.* Transl. by Bodkinson and revised by Wise, N. Y., 1896.

6.—Lardner, *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies. Works*, vii., Lond., 1788.

II.—PAGAN:

1.—**Greek:**

1.—The classics. Bohn Lib. Excellent. Fine transl. by W. H. Appleton, Bost., 1893.

2.—Polybius (204–122 B.C.), *Histories.* Transl. by E. S. Schuckburgh. 2 vols. Lond., 1889.

3.—Strabo (62 B.C.–24 A.D.), *Geography.* Transl. by Falconer and Hamilton, Lond., 1890. 2 vols. Bohn Lib.

2.—**Latin:**

1.—Virgil (70–19 B.C.). *Works.* Bohn Lib., 1894; Morley Univ. Lib., 1884.

2.—Horace (65–8 B.C.), *Works.* Transl. by Lonsdale and Lee, Lond., 1873. Best complete Eng. ed. is by Wickham. 2 vols. Oxf., 1887, 1892.

3.—Livy (59 B.C. – 17 A.D.), *Works.* Bohn Lib., 1850. Transl. by Stephenson, Lond., 1883–90.

4.—Ovid (43 B.C.–17 A.D.), *Works.* Bohn Lib. Transl. by H. T. Riley, Lond., 1852.
5.—Lucan (39–65 A.D.), *Pharsalia.* Transl. by H. T. Riley, Lond., 1853. Bohn Lib.
6.—Seneca (3–65 A.D.), *Works.* Transl. by T. Lodge, Lond., 1620. Bohn Lib. has partial list.
7.—Pliny (61–115 A.D.), *Works.* Transl. by Milmoth and Bosauquet, Lond., 1878.
8.—Tacitus (54–119 A.D.), *Works.* Bohn Lib., 1848. 2 vols. Transl. by Church and Brodribb, Lond., 1877.
9.—Juvenal (47–130 A.D.), *Works.* Bohn Lib. Transl. by Strong and Leeper, Lond., 1882.
10.—Suetonius (75–160 A.D.), *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars.* Bohn Lib., 1855. Transl. by C. Whibley, Lond., 1899. 2 vols.

III.—CHRISTIAN:

1.—*New Testament.* (27 canonical books).
2.—*New Testament Apocrypha.* In *Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, vol. 16.
3.—Justin Martyr (103–164 A.D.), *Apologies. Ib.*, vol. ii., 1–84; Am. ed., vol. i.
4.—Tertullian (104–216 A.D.), *Apology. Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, xi., 53–140. Several other transls.
5.—Minicius Felix (?), *Octavius. Ibid.*, xiii.
6.—Eusebius (d. 340), *The Evangelical Preparation.* Transl. by H. Street, Lond., 1842.
7.—St. Augustine (d. 430), *The City of God. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers.* Buf., 1886–90. ii., 16–621. Other transls.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Breed, D. R., *A History of the Preparation of the World for Christ.* N. Y., 1893.
2.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *The Gentile and the Jew.* Lond., 1862. 2 vols.
3.—Fisher, G. P., *Beginnings of Christianity.* N. Y., 1877.
4.—Hardwick, C., *Christ and Other Masters.* Lond., 1875. 2 vols.

5.—Hausrath, A., *History of the New Testament Times.* Lond., 1895. 4 vols.
6.—Maurice, F. D., *Religions of the World.* Lond. and Bost., 1854.
7.—Pressensé, De E., *Religions before Christ.* Edinb., 1862.
8.—Shahan, J. T., *The Beginnings of Christianity.* N. Y., 1904.
9.—Trench, R. C., *Christ the Desire of all Nations.* Camb., 1846.
10.—Uhlhorn, G., *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.* Lond., 1880.
11.—Wernle, P., *The Beginnings of Christianity.* Lond., 1908. 2 vols.

II.—GENERAL:

Alzog, i., § 24–31. Backhouse, E., *Early Ch. Hist.*, ch. 1. Baur, i., 1–43. Blunt, J. H., *Key to Ch. Hist.*, ch. 1. Bouzique, i., Intr. Burton, E., *Lects. on Eccles. Hist.* (to 3d cent.). Catterille, H., *Genesis of the Ch.*, ch. 1. Cheetham, ch. 1. Cox, H., *First Cent. of Christianity*, i., chs. 1–10. Darras, i., ch. 1. Döllinger, *Hist. of the Ch.*, i., ch. 1, sec. 1–2. Duff, ch. 1–6. Farrar, F. W., *Early Days of Christianity*, bk. i., ch. 1. Fisher, pd. i., ch. 1. Gibbon, i.–ii. Gieseler, i., sec. 8–19. Gilmartin, i., sec. 2–3. Guericke, pp. 21–28. Hase, 13–23. Hurst, i., 61–87. Jackson, F. J. F., *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* (to 461), ch. 2. Janes, L. G., *A Study of Prim. Christ.*, chs. 1–2. Killen, ch. 1. Kurtz, i., sec. 6–12. Milman, *Hist. of Christ.* (to 4th cent.), ch. 1. Milner, i., cent. i. Moeller, i., 26–48. Mosheim, 11–30. Neander, i., 1–69. Robertson, bk. i., ch. 1. Schaff, i., ch. 1. Waddington, ch. 1.

CHAPTER IV

ORIGIN, SPREAD, AND ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH DURING THE APOSTOLIC AGE

OUTLINE: I.—Origin of the Christian Church. II.—Spread of the Apostolic Church. III.—Organisation of the Early Church. IV.—Conclusions. V.—Sources.

THE Christian Church has both an internal and an external side—a soul and a body. Thoughts, feelings, and beliefs constitute the inner Church, the creed. These, in turn, aided by physical conditions, determine the outward organisation of the Church. In a broad sense the Church was a product of certain forces already in the world at the opening of the Christian era, which were utilised by the believers in the teachings of Jesus. From pagan and Jewish sources contributions were made to both the form and content of the Christian Church in the following ways:

1. The Jews[1] gave in ideas: (a) a belief in Jehovah as God, (b) the conception of sin, (c) a consciousness of the need of repentance and reconciliation, (d) the doctrine of immortality, (e) the conception of Heaven and Hell, (f) angels and the devil, (g) miracles, (h) the Old Testament as God's word, and (i) the Sabbath. To the form of the Christian Church they suggested:

[1] *Jewish Encyc.;* Sorley, *Jewish Christians and Judaism,* London, 1881; Bettany, *History of Judaism and Christianity,* London, 1892; *A History of Jews in Rome, B.C. 160–A.D. 604,* London, 1882; Toy, C. H., *Judaism and Christianity,* Boston, 1891.

(a) the synagogue, (b) officials like the elders, (c) ceremonies, (d) feasts,[1] and (e) organisation.[2]

2. The pagans contributed in ideas: (a) Greek philosophy and culture,[3] (b) concepts of morality,[4] (c) the idea of absolute sovereignty, and (d) universality.[5] In form they gave: (a) local organisations like the democratic Hellenistic guild or municipality,[6] or the numerous Roman social or religious associations known as *collegia* and *sodalitia* (especially the *collegia funeraticia*), and the general organisation of the Empire[7]; (b) rites and ceremonies; (c) the evening meal,[8] (d) festivals like Easter and Christmas; (e) the use of images, and (f) architecture, painting, and ornamentation.

3. The real founder of the Church, however, was Jesus Christ. He supplied the fundamental ideas of: (a) the universal fatherhood of God, (b) the divine sonship of the Saviour of the world, (c) the brotherhood of man, and (d) the ethical law of self-sacrifice. He created the Church: (a) by choosing twelve Apostles, by teaching them and by commissioning them to continue the work; (b) by winning a number of converts to His doctrines; (c) by leaving certain sacraments for His followers—Catholics say seven; most Protestants, two. But He left no written Church constitution giving

[1] Moeller, i., 69.

[2] Moeller, i., 55, 66.

[3] Kurtz, Sec. 7, No. 4.

[4] See Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. Read Baur, i., 10–17, Kurtz, Sec. 7, No. 2; *cf.* Foucard, *Les associations relig. chez les Grecs*, Paris, 1873.

[5] Kurtz, Sec. 7, No. 5.

[6] Hatch, 26–39; Kurtz, Sec. 17, Nos. 2, 3; Moeller, i., 66.

[7] Tertullian, *Apol.*, ch. 38, 39; *cf.* Mommsen, *De collegiis et sodal. Rom.*, Kil., 1843.

[8] Xenophon, *Memorabil.*, iii., 14; Athenæus, *Deipnos*, vii., 7, 68, p. 365a; Fouard, *St. Peter*, 363.

the details of organisation. The work of Jesus and His immediate followers in founding the Church is described in the New Testament. Broadly, then, the Church of Jesus Christ is composed of all the believers in the teachings of Jesus, although differing greatly in interpretation and in organisation.[1]

From Jerusalem the Apostles and disciples of Jesus spread his teachings to Syria, Asia Minor, Africa, Greece, and Rome. From these fields the propagation was continued until by the time of Constantine every point within and some places without the Empire were reached. "Throughout every city and village," enthusiastically exclaimed Eusebius, "churches were quickly established and filled with members from every people."[2] The fruitful labours of Paul and Timothy were explained thus: "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in numbers daily."[3] Other Apostles were, no doubt, equally active in various parts of the Empire. The "Christians"—a term of derision first used by the heathen of Antioch,[4]—numbering 500 in 30 A.D.,[5] grew to 500,000 by 100 A.D.,[6] and increased to 30,000,000 by 311 A.D.[7]—a growth almost unparalleled in the world's religious history. They included all the social classes in the Empire from slave to Emperor, though

[1] 1 Cor. i., 2. Illustration of this variation is found in the fact that Calvinists and most Protestants believe the Church to be an invisible organisation, while Catholics, Lutherans, Anglicans, and oriental Christians hold it to be visible.

[2] Euseb., bk. ii., ch. 3.

[3] Acts xvi., 5; *cf.* Acts ii., 47.

[4] Euseb., bk. ii., ch. 3; *cf.* Acts xi., 26.

[5] Gieseler, i., 72.

[6] Schaff, i., 196.

[7] Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 23–91. Schaff, 197, gives only 12,000,000.

the great middle class was in all probability most numerously represented.[1]

The causes for this marvellous growth[2] are found in: (a) the revolutionary teachings of Jesus, particularly the idea of immortality, which was very vague in heathen minds, and the law of love and self-sacrifice; (b) the miraculous powers attributed to the first Christians; (c) the purer and austerer morality of the early Christians; (d) the unity and discipline of the Church, making it a powerful organisation within the Empire; (e) the preparation and ripeness of the Empire for Christianity, and (f) the subjective vividness of the constant presence of Jesus with the early Christians, as explained by Paul, and their zealous propagandism.

The results of this new life, brought into the world so dramatically, must be measured in terms of all subsequent history.[3] Every institution in the Empire was modified by this new spiritual force[4] so that as old pagan imperial Rome gradually fell, new Christian Rome took its place to rule all western Europe for more than a thousand years in every sphere of human activity and endeavour.

The exact form of the organisation of the early Christian Church is extremely difficult to determine, because of the lack of sufficient positive authority in the New Testament and in patristic literature. The Acts of the Apostles and the letters of Paul and others to the first Christian communities tell nearly all

[1] Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 95–163.

[2] See Gibbon's "famous infamous," ch. 15.

[3] Church, R. W., *Civilisation before and after Christianity*, N. Y., 1872.

[4] See the works of Troplong, Schmidt, Uhlhorn, Lecky, Brace, Milman, Pressensé, etc.

any one can know about the origin and organisation of the Apostolic Church. From these sources it is clear that Jesus left certain great teachings, and many devoted believers in those truths. After His departure, the Apostles, not limited to twelve,[1] receiving authority directly from the Master,[2] like the prophets of old, spread the new pregnant faith over the world, organised their converts according to individual ideas and local needs,[3] and practically monopolised all direction of the Church.[4] With the increase of these Christian societies in size and numbers, came the necessity of appointing local officers, or of having them elected by the "brethren." In this way, at an early date, began the outward organisation of the Church. The development of the Jewish Kingdom of God into the Ecclesia of the Christians was a comparatively easy transition, especially for the Jewish converts.

Next to the Apostles in point of time, but not authority, in the Biblical account, came the deacons. At Jerusalem the Apostles had the "brethren" select "seven men of honest report" to minister to the poor and unfortunate, and to wait on the table in the daily love-feasts.[5] They were installed by "laying on of hands." This democratic example apparently was followed elsewhere.[6] Both sexes were eligible.[7] The high qualifications for the office suggest its importance.[8]

[1] 1 Cor. ix., 1, 5; xii., 28, 29; xv., 5, 7; Rom. xvi., 7.

[2] 1 Cor. xi., 23; xii., 3–8; 2 Cor. x., 8; xiii., 10; Gal. i., 8, 9, 12; Eph. iv., 11.

[3] Acts xiv., 23; Tit. i., 5.

[4] Acts ii., 42; iv., 35, 37; v., 2.

[5] Acts vi., 1–6.

[6] Phil. i., 1; 1 Tim. iii., 8; iv. 14.

[7] Rom. xvi., 1.

[8] Acts vi., 1–6; 1 Tim. iii., 8–13.

St. Paul tells us that the earliest Christian communities found it necessary to have some organisation, hence they chose bishops, or overseers, and presbyters, or elders. But throughout the New Testament the words elder, presbyter, and bishop seem to be used interchangeably.[1] The qualifications for the offices were the same. Bishops and elders are never joined together like bishops and deacons as if they were two distinct classes of officers. Timothy, for example, appoints bishops and deacons; Titus, elders and deacons. Paul sends greetings to bishops and deacons at Philippi, but omits all mention of elders and presbyters because, presumably, they were included in the conception of bishops.[2] In his pastoral epistles he describes all Church officers, but mentions only two classes, bishops or elders, and deacons.[3] Peter, who calls himself "also an elder," urges the elders to "tend the flock of God" and to "fulfil the office of bishop."[4] Even Clement of Rome uses bishop and presbyter interchangeably as late as 95 A.D.[5] Irenæus (d. 190) and Tertullian (d. 220), however, were conscious of a distinct division and differentiation.

That the official titles, bishop and presbyter or elder, were used from early apostolic days, all must admit, for the New Testament evidence is unmistakable. But perplexity and doubt arise at once when an attempt is made to determine the resemblances and differences

[1] Acts xv., 23; xvi., 4; xx., 17, 28; Phil. i., 1; 1 Tim. iii.; iv., 14; v., 17–19; Tit. i., 5–7; James v., 14; Clement, *To Corinth*, xlii., 44. *Cf.* Rev. iv., 4; v., 5, 6; vii., 11, 13.

[2] Phil. i., 1.

[3] 1 Tim. iii., 1–13; v., 17–19; Tit. i., 5–7; Heb. xi., 2.

[4] 1 Pet. v., 1–2.

[5] *To Corinth*, ch. xliii. The Didache and Shepherd of Hermas offer additional testimony on this point.

in their duties and powers. The term elder, or presbyter, may have been used merely to designate the personal relation of the most highly respected members to the congregation, while the name bishop, or overseer, may have been the official designation of leadership. Indeed some scholars, like Hatch and Harnack, believe that the functions of presbyters and bishops were distinct and different from the beginning. They assert that the college of presbyters assumed the leadership, or government proper, of the Christian community, with jurisdiction and disciplinary power, while the bishops had charge of the administration of the Church, including worship and finance, and were also largely occupied with charitable work, in co-operation with the deacons, such as care for the sick, the poor, and strangers. According to this view each congregation was organised with three sets of officers, namely, deacons, presbyters, and bishops, from the very outset. Gradually, however, an amalgamation took place. The bishops, with their practical information, received seats and votes in the presbytery and finally came to fill the office of presidency.

It seems more probable, on the contrary, that these two titles simply signify the twofold origin of the early Christians, namely, from the Jews and the pagans. The word presbyter is of Hebraic derivation, while bishop is a pure Greek term. Consequently the tendency developed to use presbyter wherever the Hebrew element predominated, and, on the other hand, to employ bishop for Greek communities. It was but natural, too, that these two terms should come to signify the same thing and should come to be used interchangeably.

The derivation of these terms is not clear.[1] Both presbyter and bishop appear to have been in use in Syria and Asia Minor to designate officers of municipal and private corporations. In Grecian civic organisations, the word bishop or superintendent was likewise commonly used. Then there were the well-known elders of the Jewish synagogue,[2] and the senators of Roman municipalities—in fact a universal respect for seniority existed in the old world. It was very natural, therefore, that the Christians should adopt the known forms, names, and offices of those organisations with which they were familiar.[3] This method of procedure is precisely the one followed over the world to-day in propagating any idea through organised effort.

These elders were apparently organised into boards, or councils, for the purpose of better furthering the interests of the Church. They were not teachers at first so much as the administrators, or business managers, of the general concerns of the Church.[4] They helped to enact ordinances[5]; discussed important questions with the Apostles and assisted them in every possible way; enforced discipline[6]; settled disputes between Christians; and prayed for the sick and anointed them.[7]

The first Christians, eagerly awaiting the literal second

[1] See various dictionaries of the Bible.

[2] Ex. xxiv., 1; Num. xi., 16; Gen. l., 7–8; Lev. iv., 15; Deut. xxi., 19; 1 Sam. xvi., 4; Ezra v., 5; Psalm cvii., 32; Ezek. viii., 1; Acts iv., 8; Matt. xxi., 23; xxvii., 1; Luke xxii., 66.

[3] Hatch, 62–66.

[4] Hatch, 69–73; Acts xx., 28–31; 1 Pet. v., 1; 1 Tim. v., 17.

[5] Acts xvi., 4.

[6] Acts xx., 29–31, 35; Tertullian, *Apol.*, 39.

[7] James v., 14.

coming of Christ, and imbued with great enthusiasm for the Gospel, did not feel the need of an elaborate constitution. But in time, as numbers increased, as severe persecution fell upon the Christians, and as the original fervour and spirituality decreased with the conversion of so many pagans, it became necessary to develop a regular system of Church government, which would more effectively meet the new conditions. The fact of differentiation in organisation is easily established, because the earliest and later forms may be determined with reasonable accuracy, but the transitional process is much more difficult of comprehension. This evolution, however, appears to have taken this course:

1. The board of presbyters, at least in the larger congregations, naturally and logically developed a head with a priority in rank. The office of president was universal in contemporary Jewish associations, and in Roman and Greek organisations. The creation of a chairman of the administrative body became a political necessity to expedite business, and to enforce discipline in the Christian societies. Moreover there was the example of the Apostles, who actually designated officers to continue their work (a) of teaching the true doctrines,[1] (b) of organising new churches, (c) of ordaining deacons and elders, and (d) in acting as head of the whole congregation.[2] Hence this change was natural, imperative, and easy; but the transition must have been gradual and must have lacked uniformity.

2. The president of the board of presbyters came, in course of time, to have a recognised supremacy in power as well as in rank, and the title of bishop was

[1] 1 Tim. i., 3.
[2] Tit. i., 5.

gradually restricted to his high office. After the death of the Apostles more duties devolved upon the president of the council, and it was in the course of things that the special word bishop, *i. e.*, overseer or superintendent, should be applied to him. By the second century, at least, if not indeed before, the differentiation had begun and from that time on it can be plainly traced in the Church Fathers. Jerome states that at Alexandria until the middle of the third century the presbyters elected one of their number as president and called him bishop.[1] Hilarius says: "Every bishop is a presbyter, but not every presbyter a bishop; for he only is bishop who is the primate among the presbyters."[2] Examples, secular and ecclesiastical, were not lacking to warrant the change: (a) the Old Testament priesthood, (b) Christ and his Apostles, (c) the Apostles and their appointees, (d) the Emperor and his officials. The bishop soon professed to occupy the place of an Apostle instead of Christ as earlier, hence arose the idea of an "Apostolic seat" and "Apostolic succession."[3] He represented Christian unity of doctrine and discipline, and ruled over a recognised territory—first a single church, then a city, then a province. From the bishop it was only another step to the archbishop, the metropolitan, the patriarch, and the Pope.

3. The position of the presbyter changes, likewise, from that of the highest officer in the Church to one subordinate (a) to the board of elders and then (b) to the bishop. This distinction once made between bishop and presbyter, there was a

[1] *Ep.* 146, *Ad Evangelum; cf. Ep.* 82 and 84. *Apost. Const.*, iii., c. 11.

[2] 1 *Ep. to Timoth.*, c. 3.

[3] Hatch, 106–109.

tendency for the bishops to usurp more and more power, while the presbyters opposed it. The third century is full of these quarrels.[1] Here began the conflict between the principles of monarchy and aristocracy in the Church. Soon, from acting as a member of a council, the presbyter came to act alone under the bishop—*i. e.*, the presbyter became a priest, just as the president became a bishop. Presbyters also assumed new functions: (a) "ministry of the word" and (b) "ministry of the sacraments." New detached communities were ruled not infrequently by single presbyters under the city bishop. Indeed it seems that from the outset the smaller and weaker Christian communities were ruled by single elders.

4. The status and functions of the deacon likewise were altered. At first he visited the sick and unfortunate, collected and disbursed alms, and reported on discipline. Stephen taught; Philip baptised. With the growth of Christian civilisation, however, institutions of relief—hospitals, orphanages, infant asylums, almshouses, poorhouses, guest-houses, etc.—took the place of the earlier personal ministrations of the deacons. Each institution had its own head, not necessarily a deacon. From being distributors of alms, therefore, the deacon first became an assistant of the bishop,[2] and later the chief helper of the priest in the administration of the sacraments. With the multiplication of the duties of this office came the archdeacons and subdeacons.

5. The many duties incident to a complex organisation gradually produced a new set of subordinate officials—the minor orders: (a) lectors to read the

[1] Neander, i., 192, 193.
[2] Hatch, 54.

Scriptures in public and to keep the books, (b) acolytes to assist the bishops, (c) exorcists to pray for those possessed of evil spirits, (d) janitors to care for the buildings and preserve order, (e) precentors to conduct public praise service, (f) catechists to instruct the catechumens, (g) interpreters to translate the Scripture lesson.[1]

6. The clergy came to be distinct from the laity—a sacerdotal class was developed. In the early Church the priesthood was universal, *i. e.*, laymen as well as Church officers could preach, baptise, administer the sacraments, and exercise discipline. The relation of clergy to laity was merely that of leadership as in non-Christian organisations. "Ordination" simply meant appointment, and was used in civic installations, while "laying on of hands" was only a symbol of prayer and even used by the Jews for secular affairs.

Gradually, however, the tendency to put the Church officials above the laity grew stronger until something akin to the Old Testament idea of the priesthood was revived. By the fourth century the Church officers had lost their primitive character and had become a separate class mediating between God and man. The causes of this separation are not difficult to see, namely: (a) the peculiar duties of the Church officials tended to give them a distinct character; (b) the persecutions to which the Roman government subjected them threw them into conspicuous relief; (c) the legalisation of Christianity bestowed upon them a distinct civil status, made them immune from public burdens like taxes and military service, exempted them from civil courts, and permitted them to acquire property; and (d) the rise

[1] Euseb., vi., 43; Neander, i., §2; Kurtz, i., §34; Alzog, i., §83; Moeller, i., 234.

of asceticism forced the clergy to observe a code of morals different from that of the laity, demanded celibacy, originated the badge of the tonsure, and created clergy-houses.

The laity were early organised in congregations. Membership in the Church was open to all believers in Jesus. The election of officers was, for the most part, democratic. The life of each congregation was socialistic and communistic. All possessions were sold for the common good and to create a common fund for the needy.[1] The members enjoyed a common evening meal and their common love-feast which was to them the highest act of worship.[2] Disobedience, or infidelity, might be punished by private admonition, public correction, and in stubborn cases excommunication.[3] But after the first century these communistic-democratic societies were gradually replaced by a hierarchical organisation with new or modified institutions. The monarchio-episcopal principle of church government was gradually evolved but, nevertheless, much of the primitive democracy remained. This evolution in the government of the Church may be clearly seen by the end of the second century.

From this discussion these conclusions may be drawn:

1. The New Testament does not furnish a satisfactory model for any one distinct organisation of the Christian Church.

2. In the New Testament, however, are found the germs from which sprang deacons, priests, bishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and popes.

[1] Acts ii., 44, 45.
[2] Acts ii., 42, 46.
[3] Mat. xviii., 15–18; Tit. iii., 10; 1 Cor. v., 5.

3. The elements from which the Church was organised already existed in large measure in human society. Hence the Church, in its outward form, had a natural historical growth and was influenced by (a) the Jewish synagogue, (b) Greek municipalities, (c) the Roman government, (d) local needs, and (e) the conditions of the times. The animating principle and causal inspiration was Christianity.

4. Christian society, like human society, was subject to constant change which is easily detected. The form of organisation, originally democratic, was gradually changed by the force of circumstances until it became monarchial and at the same time the officers underwent a similar transformation.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

I.—JEWISH:

1.—Josephus, *Jewish War*, *Against Apion*, *Autobiography*, Whiston ed.

2.—Philo Judæus. *Works*. 4 vols. Bohn Lib., 1854–5.

3.—*Talmud*. Transl. by Rodkinson; rev. by Wise, N. Y., 1896.

II.—HEATHEN:

1. Lucan, Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius. See Chap. III. of this work

2. Celsus (c. 178 A.D.), *Against the Christians*. Transl. by Lardner, Lond., 1830.

3. Porphyry (d. 306), *Against the Christians*. *Ib.*

4. Julian (d. 363), *Against the Christians*. *Ib.* Also Transl. by Nevins, Lond., 1873. *Works*. Bohn Lib., 1888. Transl. by Duncombe, Lond., 1784. *Public Letters*. Transl. by Chinnock, Lond., 1901.

III.—CHRISTIAN:

1.—**New Testament** (27 canonical books).

2.—**New Testament Apocrypha**. Schaff, i., 188. Transl. in *Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, vol. xvi.

1.—*Acts*. Transl. by Phillips, Lond., 1876.
2.—*Epistles*—6 by Paul and 8 by Seneca.
3.—*Apocalypses*—of the Apostles.

3.—**Apostolic Fathers:**
1.—Clement of Rome (97?), *Epist. to the Ch. of Corinth.* Best ed. by Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, N. Y. 1891.
2.—Ignatius (d. 70–115), *Epistles* (7). *Ib.* See Killen.
3.—Barnabas(?), *Epistle.* Lightfoot; Cunningham.
4.—Polycarp (d. 156), *Epistle.* Lightfoot; Jackson.
5.—Papias (d. 153?), *Fragments.* Lightfoot; Hall.
6.—Shepherd of Hermas(?). Lightfoot; Hoole.
7.—*Didache*(?). Hoole; Hitchcock.

4.—**Post-Apostolic Fathers:**
1.—Justin Martyr (d. 164 ?), *Works. Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, ii.; Am. ed., i.
2.—Irenæus (d. 202 ?), *Works. Ib.*, v., ix.; Am. ed., i.; *Fathers of the Holy Cath. Ch.*, ch. 42.
3.—Hippolytus(?), *Works. Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, ii., 130; vi., 15–403.
4.—Victor (d. 200 ?), *Works. Ib.*, xviii., 388–434.
5.—Tertullian (d. 230 ?), *Works. Ib.*, i., 408; ii., 25; iii., 118; xi., 53–140; xviii.; Am. ed., iii.–iv.
6.—Origen (d. 254 ?), *Works. Ib.*, ii., 1–3; x.; Am. ed., iv.
7.—Cyprian (d. 258 ?), *Works. Ib.*, viii; xiii., 1–264; Am. ed., v.
8.—Dionysius of Alexandria (d. 264 ?), *Works. Ib.*, xx., 157–265.
9.—Tatian (d. 166 ?), *Works. Ib.*, iii., 1–46; Am. ed., ii.
10.—Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers.* 1. Other translations.

5.—**Collections:**
1.—*Apostolic Constitutions. Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, xvii. Am, ed., vii.

2.—O'Leary, L. E., *Apostol. Const. and Cognate Documents*, N. Y., 1906.
3.—*Apostolical Canons*, Tr. by R. C. Jenkins. Lond., 1856. See Harnack, *Sources of the Apostolic Canons*. Lond., 1895.
4.—Conybeare, F. C., *The Apology and Acts of Apollonius and other Monuments of early Christianity*. N. Y., 1894.
5.—Lardner, N. *Jewish and Heathen Testimonials*. In his *Works*, vii–ix.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Allies, T. W., *The Formation of Christendom*, 4 vols. Lond., 1895.
2.—Anderdon, W. H., *Fasti Apostolici*. Lond., 1884.
3.—Anson, A. J. R., *The Church: its Organisation in the Time of the Apostles*. Lond., 1886.
4.—Barnes, A., *Organisation and Government of the Apostolic Church*. Phila., 1854.
5.—Bartlett, J. V., *The Apostolic Age*. N. Y., 1900.
6.—Baumgarten, M., *The Acts of the Apostles*. 3 vols. N. Y., 1854.
7.—Capes, J. M., *The Church of the Apostles*. Lond., 1886.
8.—Catterille, H., *The Genesis of the Church*. Edinb., 1872.
9.—Colman, L., *Ancient Christianity*. Phila., 1853.
10.—Cox, H., *The First Century of Christianity*. Lond., 1892.
11.—Cutts, E. L., *Notes of Lessons on the Church in the New Testament*. N. Y., 1892.
12.—Davidson, S., *The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*. Lond., 1855.
13.—Dobschütz, E. von, *The Early Christian Communities*. N. Y., 1903. *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*. N. Y., 1904.
14.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *The First Age of Christianity and the Church*. 2 vols. Lond., 1877.
15.—Fairbairn, A. M., *Christianity in the First Century*. Lond., 1883.

16.—Falconer, J. W., *From Apostle to Priest.* Edinb., 1900.
17.—Farrar, F. W., *The Early Days of Christianity.* N. Y. 1882.
18.—Fisher, G. P., *Beginnings of Christianity.* N. Y., 1888.
19.—Giles, J. A., *Apostolical Records of Early Christianity.* Lond., 1886.
20.—Harnack, A., *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* Lond., 1904–1905. 2 vols.
21.—Hatch, E., *Growth of Church Institutions.* Lond., 1887. *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Church.* Lond., 1890. *Organisation of the Early Churches.* Lond., 1888.
22.—Hausrath, A., *The Time of the Apostles.* 4 vols. Lond., 1895.
23.—Hinds, S., and Newman, J. H., *History of the Christian Church in the First Century.* Lond., 1862.
24.—Hort, F. J. A., *The Christian Ecclesia.* Lond., 1897.
25.—Jacob, G. A., *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament.* N. Y., 1874.
26.—Janes, L. G., *Study of the Primitive Church.* Bost., 1886.
27.—Lightfoot, J. B., *Apostolic Fathers.* N. Y., 1891. *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age.* N. Y., 1892.
28.—Maurice, J. F. D., *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.* Camb., 1854.
29.—McGiffert, A. C., *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* N. Y., 1891.
30.—Merivale, L. A., *Christian Records.* Lond., 1857.
31.—Miller, E., *The Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament.* Lond., 1876.
32.—Neander, A., *Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* N. Y., 1856.
33.—Orr, J., *Neglected Factors in the Study of the Progress of Christianity.* N. Y., 1899. *The Early Church: its History and Literature.* N. Y., 1901.

34.—Palmer, R., *The Catholic and Apostolic Church.* Lond., 1899.
35.—Pressensé, E. De, *Early Days of Christianity.* 4 vols. N. Y., 1873–8.
36.—Pryce, J., *Notes on the History of the Early Church.* Lond., 1892.
37.—Ramsay, W. M., *The Church in the Roman Empire.* N. Y., 1893.
38.—Reichel, C. P., *The Origins of the Church.* Dub., 1882.
39.—Renan, E., *Origins of Christianity.* Lond., 1888.
40.—Ropes, J. H., *The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism.* N. Y., 1906.
41.—Row, C. A., *Apostolical Christianity.* Lond., 1881.
42.—Schaff, P., *History of the Apostolic Church.* N. Y., 1874.
43.—Simcox, W. H., *The Beginnings of the Christian Church.* Lond., 1881.
44.—Slater, W. F., *Faith and Life of the Early Church.* Lond., 1892.
45.—Stanley, A. P., *Apostolic Age.* Oxf., 1874.
46.—Tarrant, W. G., *Beginnings of Christendom.* Lond., 1893.
47.—Taylor, I., *Ancient Christianity.* Lond., 1844.
48.—Thatcher, O. J., *History of the Apostolical Church.* N. Y., 1893.
49.—Thiersch, H. W. J., *History of the Christian Church in the Apostolic Age.* Lond., 1852.
50.—Vaughan, C. S., *The Church of the First Days.* 3 vols. Lond., 1864.
51.—Vedder, H. C., *Dawn of Christianity.* Phila., 1894.
52.—Watson, R. A., *Apostolic Age.* Lond., 1894.
53.—Weizsäcker, C., *The Apostolic Age.* 2 vols. N. Y., 1894. *Antiqua Mater.* Lond., 1887.
54.—Wernle, P., *The Beginnings of Christianity.* N. Y., 1902.

II.—GENERAL:

Alzog, i., 117–160. Backhouse, pt. i., ch. 1, 2. Baur, ii., 16–61. Blunt, i., ch. 2–5. Bouzique, i., ch. 1, 2. Bright, W., ch. 1. Burton, ch. 8. Butler, ch. 2, 4, 5. Chantrel, ch. 1, 2. Cheetham,

ch. 2, 4, 7, 8. Coxe, ch. 2. Crooks, ch. 3, 10, 18. Cunningham, lect. 1, 2. Dehorbe, ch. 28–32. Döllinger, J. J. I., i., ch. 1, sec. 4, 5; ch. 3, sec. 1–4. Duff, 79, 105, 108, 110, 120, 139, 157, 226, 260, 304, 396. Fisher, pd. i., ch. 2; pd. ii., ch. 1, 2. Fitzgerald, i., 63–75, 118–129. Foulkes, ch. 1, 2. Gieseler, sec. 25–30. Gilmartin, i., ch. 4. Guericke, 106–139. Hase, 24–41. Hore, ch. 1, 2. Hurst, i., 61–149. Jackson, ch. 3, 10. Jennings, i., ch. 1, 2. Killen, sec. 3, ch. 3. Kurtz, i., 22–36, 52–64. Mahan, bk. i., ch. 11; bk. ii., ch. 48. Milman, bk. i., ch. 1. Moeller, i., 62–68. Neander, i., sec. 2, 3. Newman, A. H., pd. i., ch. 1–3. Robertson, bk. i., ch. 8. Schaff, i., 187–217; 432–506. Sikes, ch. 2.

CHAPTER V

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND PETER'S PRIMACY

OUTLINE: I.—Planting of the church in Rome and its organisation there. II.—The two opposing views of the Petrine theory. III.—Proofs advanced for the Petrine theory. IV.—Evidence given against the Petrine theory. V.—Historical conclusions. VI.—Sources.

REPORTS concerning the teachings and labours of Jesus must have early reached Rome.[1] A perpetual stream of strangers and provincials flowed into Rome from every quarter of the Empire, hence every new creed, theory, and organisation was soon known in the capital.[2] Roman merchants, sailors, soldiers, or public officials, or the Jews, or the Greeks, might have carried news of the new sect to the heart of imperial power. Tertullian mentions the legend that Emperor Tiberius sought to include Jesus among the Roman gods, but his plan was frustrated by the Roman Senate.[3] Eusebius declared that this same ruler, "being obviously pleased with the doctrine," threatened "death to the accusers of the Christians."[4] It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that Christianity, soon after its birth, was introduced into the Eternal City.

[1] Moeller, i., 67, 75; *cf.* Acts xviii., 1–3.
[2] Gibbon, i., 579.
[3] *Apol.*, 5; Suetonius, *Life of Claudius*, 25.
[4] Euseb., ii., c. 2.

It appears clear, too, that Christian converts were early won in Rome, or else migrated thither from other parts of the Empire. It is not at all improbable that many of these early Christians in the capital were Jews.[1] Paul said that upon his arrival in Italy he "found brethren" at Puteoli and that a week later Christians came out of the city of Rome to greet him.[2] It is also quite probable that these various Christian communities in Italy had already created loose local organisations. Paul, during his prolonged stay in Rome, undoubtedly converted many to the new faith and laboured to perfect their Church organisation.[3] The magnificent work done by this Apostle in promulgating the new faith throughout western Europe was sealed by a martyr's death at Rome.[4]

It appears, also, that the Apostle Peter laboured at Rome, probably after Paul, and completed the organisation of the Church. Tradition likewise gives him a martyr's crown. The Roman Church, therefore, founded by two Apostles and nourished by their heroic blood, was a double apostolic seat. This unusual origin, coupled with the fact of location in the heart of the world, together with a hundred other causes, made the Roman Church very conspicuous from the first and enabled it to become the determining factor in Western civilisation for fifteen hundred years. Under these circumstances it was but natural that the head of the Roman Church should come to have superior respect,

[1] Shortly before the Christian era the Jews were so numerous that 8000 could sign a petition to the Emperor.—Josephus, *Antiq.*, xvii., c. 11.

[2] Acts xxviii., 14–16; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, ch. 15.

[3] Acts xxviii., 24, 30, 31.

[4] Euseb., ii., c. 22.

primacy in rank, and leadership in power, first in Italy, and then throughout western Europe.

The mother Church in Rome was imbued with great missionary zeal, and spread the new faith with extraordinary rapidity. In 64 A.D. the Christians in Rome, according to the heathen historian Tacitus, constituted a "huge multitude."[1] By 250 the Roman bishop ruled over forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, and fifty readers, exorcists, and porters.[2] The Christians in Rome, a city of possibly one million, numbered at least fifty thousand as estimated by Gibbon[3] and possibly three times that many as reckoned by later investigators.[4] Optatus, Bishop of Mileve in Numidia, asserted that in 300 there were forty churches in the Eternal City. While possibly a few churches may have been planted in western Europe independently, just as in Rome, still, in general, Christianity was disseminated throughout western Europe and the western part of northern Africa through the apostolic organisation in the capital city. Paul may have even made a visit to Spain.[5] Bede says that King Lucius asked the Roman bishop in 156 to send missionaries to Britain[6] and Tertullian confirmed the declaration.[7] In France a church was planted at Lyons in 177 and another at Vienne.[8] In the third century, asserts Gregory of Tours, seven Roman mis-

[1] *Annals*, xv., 44.
[2] Euseb., vi., c. 43.
[3] Gibbon, i., ch. 15.
[4] Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 39.
[5] Rom. xv., 24; *Muratorian Fragment;* Clement of Rome, *To Corinth*, c. 5; Alzog, i., 125; Kurtz, i., 44.
[6] *Eccl. Hist.*, c. 4.
[7] *Against Jud.*, c. 7.
[8] Euseb., v., c. 1.

sionaries went to Gaul and there became seven bishops with subordinate churches. The famous St. Denis of Paris was one of these pioneers.[1] Christianity was likewise early carried into Germany (cis-Rhenana)[2] and across the Mediterranean to north-western Africa.[3] It is a matter of no great surprise, therefore, to see the Roman Church revered as the great mother Church of the West. Paul speaks of the faith of Rome as "proclaimed throughout the whole world."[4]

The process of Church organisation at Rome was no doubt quite similar to that described in the preceding chapter, with this difference, however, that the episcopal system was either present from the time Peter and Paul appointed a successor, or at least began very early. Through his presbyters, or priests, the Bishop of Rome at first ruled over a number of separate communities in the city. As the faithful spread the gospel beyond the walls, churches were organised in the villages and jurisdiction over them became vested in priests sent out by the bishops. In time, however, the churches in the chief centres of population demanded bishops of their own; they were appointed, or elected, under influence from Rome, and, consequently, acknowledged allegiance to the Roman See. There is incontrovertible evidence that by the fourth century every city in Italy had a bishop. The village bishops naturally looked to the city bishops for assistance and advice. The city bishops similarly depended upon the bishop in the capital of the province, and the provincial bishop in

[1] *Annales Francorum.*

[2] Irenæus, *Against Her.*, i., c. 10.

[3] Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 37; Cyprian, *Ep.*, 71, 73; Augustine, *On Bap.*, ii., c. 13.

[4] Rom. i., 8.

like manner recognised the superiority of the bishop in the capital of the Empire. Thus the power of the Roman bishop was gradually extended first over Italy and then over western Europe. The consciousness of a unity of belief, unity of interest, and unity of purpose developed comparatively early among the churches. A name for this unity is first found in Ignatius and was the Universal or Catholic Church.[1] Before long the Bishop of Rome was to claim, by divine appointment and arrangement, sovereign jurisdiction over the great organisation.

The classes won to the new faith in the city of Rome through the zeal of the Roman Christians included representatives from the slave to the imperial family. The earliest converts may have been the Jews, who were quite numerous in the Eternal City, and who best understood the significance of Christianity. The hope and faith and love of the new teaching appealed powerfully to the lowest social classes—the wretched slave and the impoverished freedman.[2] The need and the truth of this lofty, universal creed also won adherents from the great creative middle class—including not only the educated but also the soldiers, tradespeople, farmers, imperial officials, and skilled workmen. In fact the marvellous vitality and the unparalleled growth of Christianity in Rome can be explained satisfactorily only upon the supposition that the representation of this class was very great.[3] From the nobility

[1] The pagan writer Celsus was familiar with this idea as early as 161 A.D.

[2] But nothing could be farther from the truth than Gibbon's statement that the Christians were won "almost entirely" from the "dregs of the populace." See Orr, *Neglected Factors*.

[3] Ramsay in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, 57, goes so far as to say that the new faith "spread at first among the educated more

converts were likewise secured and even in the Emperor's household followers were found.[1] In short, the whole social and moral structure of Rome was leavened by the new ideas.

Along with this unparalleled growth of the power of the Roman bishop was created the Petrine theory destined to have a powerful effect on the history of the Church. Since an inquiry into this theory has a peculiar significance for the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, and the Protestant, it is necessary to consider the subject rather carefully from the standpoint of both its advocates and opponents.

The Roman Catholic belief is that Jesus came to organise His Church on earth; that He appointed Peter to be his successor and head of the Church; that Peter went to Rome, established the Church there in the great capital city, laboured as its head twenty-five years, and died there as a martyr; that Peter transmitted his leadership and primacy to the Bishop of Rome, whom he appointed as his successor, and who in turn transferred it to succeeding popes; that the Roman Church, therefore, is the only true Church, and that these contentions are conclusively proved from the Bible, the Church Fathers, traditions, and monuments.[2]

The Greek Catholic view coincides with Rome in asserting the divine origin of the Church. A

---

rapidly than among the uneducated." This statement, however, is probably an exaggeration. See an excellent discussion in Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 95–163; Merivale, *The Romans under the Empire*, ch. 54.

[1] Phil. iv., 22; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 171 ff.; Howson, *St. Paul*, ch. 26; Weizäcker, *Apost. Age*, ii., 132; Harnack, *Princeton Rev.*, 1878, p. 257; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., c. 18.

[2] Alzog, i., §§ 48, 52, 53; Berington and Kirk, ii., 1–113; Gibbons, *Faith of Our Fathers; Cath. Encyc.*

certain honourable primacy is conceded to the Apostle Peter; and to his successors at Rome, as patriarchs of the West, is granted a kind of supreme leadership in the Church. But the patriarchs of the East are put on an equality with the Pope of Rome, and thus the extreme claims of the Petrine theory are denied.

Protestant opinion on the other hand takes two forms:

1. The pro-Petrine view, held chiefly by the Episcopalians, maintains that Jesus turned His Church over to all His Apostles; that upon their death they transmitted their leadership to succeeding bishops; that Peter was in Rome and, with Paul, helped to organise the Church there, and appointed a successor through whom apostolic power has been transmitted to all bishops appointed by the Bishop of Rome, or by his appointees, where it now resides; that bishops and their successors appointed by Apostles other than Peter have just as much power as the Bishop of Rome, because the fruits of Peter's work are merely the most marked, but not necessarily the only divine or the most divine; that adequate proofs of this position are found in history, the Church Fathers, and the Scriptures.

2. The anti-Petrine view, taken by most Protestants, asserts that Jesus left no Church organisation; that he did not appoint Peter as his successor; that whatever leadership Peter had, came from his temperament and natural ability; that there is no positive proof of Peter's being in Rome, consequently he could not have founded the Church there and named a successor; that therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the only true Church, and that abundant proof of this position can be supplied.

It may be well now to examine the proof offered in support of the Petrine theory under the four following heads:

1. *Peter's primacy.* Jesus said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; . . . And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[1] No such words were addressed to any other Apostle, hence Peter is the foundation-stone of the Church. Just as God changed Abram's name to Abraham, when he called him to be the father of a mighty nation, so Jesus gave Peter a new name.[2] Peter was chosen to be present with James and John on important occasions, like the healing of the daughter of Jairus[3]; the glorification of Jesus[4]; the struggle in Gethsemane[5]; and on all these occasions Peter is named first in the record. He likewise was the first to whom the risen Christ appeared.[6] Before His ascension Jesus gave Peter charge over His whole fold—laity, priests, and bishops,—when He commanded, "Feed my sheep," and twice repeated, "Feed my lambs."[7] These facts are sufficient, it is believed, to warrant the belief that Jesus appointed Peter to be the head of His Church.

[1] Matt. xvi., 18, 19. In Syro-Chaldaic, the tongue probably used by Jesus, "Peter" means "rock" or "cephas." The only parallel in modern languages is in French: "Tu es Pierre, et sur cette pierre," etc. *Cf.* John i., 42.

[2] John i., 42.

[3] Mark v., 37; Luke viii., 51.

[4] Matt. xvii., 1; Mark ix., 2; Luke ix., 28.

[5] Matt. xxvi., 37; Mark xiv., 33.

[6] Luke xxiv., 12, 34; *cf.* John xx., 2–10; Weizäcker, i., § 3.

[7] Luke xxii., 31–32; John xxi., 15–18.

2. *Peter's exercise of his primacy.* Next to Jesus, he stands head and shoulders above all the other Apostles in his activity. The first twelve chapters of Acts are devoted to him. His name always comes first in the lists of Apostles, and Judas Iscariot's last.[1] He performed the first recorded miracle,[2] and was the first to address the Jews in Jerusalem, while the other Apostles stood around to see three thousand converted.[3] He was first to win converts from both the Jews[4] and from the Gentiles,—Cornelius and his friends.[5] He was the first to inflict ecclesiastical punishment on offenders.[6] He fought the first heretic in the Christian Church.[7] He made the earliest apostolic visitation of the churches.[8] When a successor to Judas was chosen, Peter alone spoke, and the other Apostles silently acted on his advice.[9] In the council of Jerusalem Peter first spoke, when the disputes ceased and "all the multitude kept silence"; even James obeyed.[10] James was beheaded by Herod, but no tumult resulted. Peter was imprisoned about the same time, and the whole Church was aroused about it.[11] St. Paul himself plainly admitted Peter's pre-eminence.[12] These deeds clearly indicate, it is contended, that Peter consciously exercised the primacy bestowed upon him, and that his fellow Apostles recognised it.

3. *Peter's visit to Rome, and martyrdom there.* Peter's First Epistle, addressed from "Babylon,"

[1] Matt. x., 2–4; Mark iii., 16–19; Luke vi., 14–16; Acts i., 13.
[2] Acts iii., 1–12.
[3] Acts ii., 14–41.
[4] Acts ii., 41.
[5] Acts x.
[6] Acts v., 1 ff.
[7] Acts viii., 21.
[8] Acts ix., 32.
[9] Acts i., 13–26.
[10] Acts xv., 6–12.
[11] Acts xii.
[12] Gal. i., 18; ii., 11.

naturally interpreted, proves that he wrote it in Rome.[1] Clement of Rome (96 A.D.) said, "Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles,—Peter, who endured many labours, and having borne his witness, went to the appointed place of glory," etc.[2] Ignatius of Antioch (115), in a letter to the Romans, mentions Peter as having exhorted them. Papias (130) interpreted 1 Peter v., 13 to mean Rome.[3] Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth (170), wrote Soter, Bishop of Rome, about the common activity of Peter and Paul in Italy.[4] Irenæus (190) wrote, "Matthew . . . published his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and founding the Church there."[5] Clement of Alexandria (200) said that Peter, "the elect, the chosen one, the first of the disciples," preached at Rome.[6] Tertullian (200) positively asserted Peter's presence in Rome, and is the first to describe the manner of his death, in Nero's reign.[7] Origen (250) declared that Peter was the great foundation of the Church, and that "at last, having arrived in Rome, he was crucified, head downward, having himself requested that he might so suffer."[8] Commodion (250) named Peter and Paul as Neroian martyrs; and Caius, a Roman presbyter (250), makes a like assertion.[9] Cyprian (d. 258) was the first to call Rome the *locum Petri*, while Hippolytus

[1] 1 Peter v., 13. St. John everywhere in his Apocalypse calls Rome Babylon: xiv., 8; xvii., 18.

[2] *1 Ep. to Corinth*, Sec. 5.

[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., c. 15; iii., c. 39.

[4] *Ib.*, ii., c. 25.

[5] *Against Heresy*, iii., 3, No. 2.

[6] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., c. 14.

[7] *De Præsc. Hæret.* c. 36.

[8] *Cf.* Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., c. 1.
Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., c. 25.

recorded Peter's conflict with Simon Magnus at Rome.[1] The Muratorian Canon referred to the "passion of Peter" in close connection with Paul's journey to Rome.[2] Peter of Alexandria (306) believed Peter was crucified there, and Lactantius accepted it as undoubted.[3] "The Doctrine of Addai" (fourth century) of the Syriac Church mentioned the "Epistles of Paul which Simon Peter sent us from the City of Rome."[4] Eusebius, using all previous testimony, made the most complete and convincing statement, which caps the climax of the overwhelming proof.[5] The "Deposito Martyrum" gave the report of the removal of the two Apostles' bodies in 258 to the catacombs. Jerome (d. 420) added the information that Peter laboured twenty-five years in Rome before his martyrdom.[6]

4. *Peter as the first Pope in Rome.* With the establishment of Peter's primacy and his presence in Rome, it is certainly warrantable to conclude that he perfected the organisation of the Church there and served as its head until his death, when he appointed a successor. Clement (96) and Ignatius (115), Dionysius (170) and Irenæus (190), Commodion (250) and Lactantius (d. 330), all in speaking of Peter and Paul as founders of the Roman Church, always name Peter first. Ignatius spoke of the "presidency" of the Roman Church under Peter, and Tertullian (b. 160) asserted that Jesus gave the keys to Peter, the "Bishop

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., c. 13, 14.
[2] James, *Apocr. Anecdota*, ii., p. x.
[3] *Inst. Div.*, iv., 21.
[4] Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Docs.*, 33.
[5] *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., c. 14, 15, 17, 25; iii., 21, 31; v., 6.
[6] For passages from later writers consult Lipsius, 236, Ramsay, Harnack, Farrar, Lightfoot, McGiffert, Schaff, Renan, Neander, Lea, Kurtz, Hase, Moeller, etc.

of Bishops" at Rome, and through him to the Church. Origen (d. 254) called Peter "the Prince of the Apostles" and "the great foundation of the Church." All the earliest lists of Popes began with Peter and indicate the transmission of his power.[1] Cyprian (d. 258) gave the complete statement of the primacy of the Roman bishop and the unity of the Church through Peter and Jesus.[2]

This sums up, essentially, all the proofs offered in support of the Petrine theory, and constitutes, it must be confessed, a powerful and consistent case.

It is necessary now, in the next place, to look at the evidence offered in opposition to the Petrine theory. For the sake of clearness, this evidence will be given under the four heads just employed:

1. *Peter's primacy.* The famous passage, "Thou art Peter," etc., correctly interpreted, does not warrant a belief in Peter's primacy. "Peter" may mean "rock" ("cephas"), but it here refers to Christ, not Peter, or to Peter's confession, just made,[3] or to Peter's faith, or to Peter merely as a type of all the Apostles.[4] Furthermore the commission to "bind" and to "loose"

[1] Hegesippus made a list of bishops in Rome in the time of Anicetus (155–168) but it is now lost (Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iv., c. 22). Eusebius used that list, and also gave two lists of his own in Greek with Peter as the first (*Chronicon*, ii.; *Eccl.; Hist.*, v., c. 6). The first Latin list is the *Catalogus Liberianus* (352?), based upon earlier lists. St. Augustine (*Ep.* 53) and Optatus (*Donatist Schism*, ii., 3) both give Latin lists. These lists show how early the whole Church recognised the importance of the succession of Roman bishops. The list made out by Irenæus in the time of Bishop Eleutherus (174–189) gives Peter and Paul as the joint founders of the Church.

[2] *Epistles* 43, 5; 55; 59, 7 and 14; 71, 3; 73, 7; 75, 17; *Ante-Nic. Fathers*, v., 263–596; Robinson, *Readings*, i., ch. 4.

[3] Matt. xvi., 16.

[4] Lightfoot, *Clement*, ii., 481–490; Hort, *Ecclesia*, 16.

and the promise connected with it were not intended exclusively for Peter but for all the Apostles[1]; Peter stood only for a type.[2] The change of Peter's name does not carry with it any special significance. Peter himself never mentioned his primacy in his speeches or writings,[3] and nowhere else in the New Testament is it distinctly stated or recognised by others. Whatever natural capacity for leadership Peter may have possessed, it cannot be proved that he received an official primacy. Such a position would have conflicted likewise with the supremacy of Jesus.

2. *Peter's exercise of his primacy.* The numerous instances where Peter took the lead, or acted, or spoke first,[4] or where his name heads lists of Apostles,[5] merely show that he was a man of impulsive, aggressive character, who would and did naturally take the lead in powers common to all the Apostles. At the council of Jerusalem Peter did not preside, as he would have done if he was the recognised "Prince of the Apostles," but only made the first speech.[6] Paul would not have rebuked Peter to his face about some very important points had Peter been the recognised head of the Church.[7] Peter was a coward, braggart, and traitor, and was reproved again and again by Jesus Himself,[8] who would not have chosen such a person to be the head of the Church. There is not a single

[1] Matt. xviii., 18.
[2] John xxi., 15–18; Luke xxii., 31, 32.
[3] *Cf.* Acts; 1 Pet. 1–3; 2 Pet.
[4] Acts i., 13–26; ii., 14–41; iii., 1–12; x.; xv., 7–12, etc.
[5] Matt. x., 2; xvii., 1; xxvi., 37; Mark iii., 16; v., 37; ix., 2; xiv., 33; Luke vi., 14; viii., 51; ix., 28; Acts i., 13.
[6] Acts xv., 1–11.
[7] Gal. ii., 11–14.
[8] Luke xxii., 31; John xiii., 36–38; Matt. xvi., 23, etc.

reference in the New Testament to show that Peter ever attempted to exercise a primacy over his companions. He called himself a fellow "elder."[1]

3. *Peter's presence in Rome.* There is not a syllable in the New Testament to warrant the conclusion that Peter was in Rome. Inference alone makes "Babylon"[2] the Eternal City. On the contrary, there are implications in the Scriptures that he was not in Rome. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans greeted all his friends, but said not a word about Peter. This would clearly indicate that Peter had not been in Rome before this Epistle was written, nor at the time it was written. Again in letters written from Rome, Paul is strangely silent about Peter's presence. The claim rests wholly upon tradition, therefore, and that is far from conclusive. There is a significant silence from the time of 2 Peter until that of Clement (96). Clement, to be sure, mentions Peter's martyrdom; but it is only by inference that the place is Rome. Not until well on in the second century did the legend about Peter's connection with Rome begin to circulate, and not until the third century did Tertullian assert positively that Peter was martyred in Rome under Nero. After that the assertion was generally accepted over the Church as a truth.[3]

4. *Peter as the first Roman Pope.* This, of course, is precluded by the want of adequate evidence of Peter's presence and labours in Rome.

The evidence adduced here ends with the sweeping denial of every claim of the Petrine theory.

[1] 1 Pet. v., 1. See 2 John i., 1; 3 John i., 1.

[2] 1 Pet. v., 13.

[3] *Cf.* Lipsius for a full discussion of the so-called "Simonian theory."

Having now stated the two sides of the question there still remains the duty of making the historical summary from the sources available, namely, both the canonical and apocryphal books of the New Testament, and the traditional evidence in the Church Fathers. The New Testament, as the most important source of information, reveals Peter's birthplace,[1] occupation,[2] marriage,[3] call by Jesus,[4] and elevation to apostleship.[5] It shows the conspicuous leadership of Peter in the apostolic college—indeed, a primacy which Jesus Himself recognised,—yet leaves the character of that primacy and the power to transfer it to a successor open to question. The New Testament evidence does not give any clue to Peter's movements after Paul's notice of him in Galatians ii. except the reference in 1 Peter, which naturally, but not literally, interpreted might indicate that he was in Rome (Babylon). It likewise affords very scanty grounds, therefore, for believing that Peter first established the Church in Rome, or that he was the first Bishop of Rome, or that he conferred his power upon a successor.

Traditional evidence, on the contrary, is more favourable to Peter's presence in Rome. No one can possibly doubt that the Petrine theory was generally believed in western Christendom at least after the third century. Prior to the third century, there are many streams of testimony which converge in positive support of at least a portion of the Petrine theory:

1. The official lists and records of the Roman

[1] John i., 44.
[2] Matt. iv., 18; Mark i., 16–20.
[3] Matt. viii., 14; Mark i., 29–31; Luke iv., 38.
[4] Matt. iv., 18; xix., 27; Mark i., 16; John i., 35, 40, 51; Luke v.; xviii., 28.
[5] Mark iii., 13–19; Luke vi., 12–16.

Church, some of which must rest upon earlier sources, accept the whole question as proved and recognised generally.

2. The transference of Peter's remains to a new resting place in 258 shows that the tradition was definite and unquestioned early in the third century.

3. The writings of Caius, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian indicate that the theory was accepted in Asia, Alexandria, Carthage, and Rome at the same period.

4. A passage from Irenæus, who probably used the official documents in Rome and who may have known St. John and his companions, carries the legend back to the second century.

5. The testimony of Dionysius of Corinth (d. 165), Papias, and Ignatius (d. 114) carries the belief back through the second to the first century.

6. The clear testimony of Clement of Rome makes a connecting link at the close of the first century.

Hence when the various pieces of evidence—the official sources, the monumental testimony, and the writings of the early Fathers,—which are independent and consistent, are combined they form a solid body of proof, which is practically irresistible, that Peter was in Rome. Likewise the absolute absence of any rival tradition from other cities adds greatly to the probability.

Peter's presence and death in Rome may be admitted as an established fact. If in Rome, whether one year or twenty-five years, Peter, with his aggressive nature, with his marked ability for leadership, and with his capacity for organisation, must have had a great deal to do with the establishment of the Roman Church, either jointly with Paul, or independently of him. Nor

does it seem to be a misuse of the law of historical probabilities to assert that Peter, either with Paul or without him, appointed a bishop for the Church of Rome and transferred to that bishop his apostolic authority. From these facts, based almost entirely upon traditional evidence, coupled with the peculiar primacy conceded to Peter in the New Testament by his fellow Apostles, gradually developed the Petrine theory with all its sweeping claims.

The admission of the belief that the Petrine theory is founded on certain established facts, and not merely on fancies and myths, does not carry with it the recognition of all the assertions which form a part of that theory. Peter's unique leadership in the apostolic college, his activity in founding the Roman Church, and his naming of a successor, who in time became the Pope, may all be granted without carrying with it the necessity of accepting the assertion that Christ chose Peter to be the head of a definite, divinely-planned Church and that Peter, conscious of that great mission, went to the capital of the Roman Empire, and there organised the only true Church on earth.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—CHRISTIAN:

1.—**New Testament** (27 canonical books).

2.—**New Testament Apocrypha** (see Chap. III).

3.—**Church Fathers**:

1.—Clement of Rome. *Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, i., ch. 5; iii., ch. 12 ff.; Am. ed., ix.

2.—Ignatius. *Ib.*, i., 137 ff., 449 ff.

3.—Papias. *Ib.*, i., 441 ff.

4.—Dionysius of Corinth (d. 178 ?). Euseb., ii., 25.

5.—Clement of Alexandria (d. 218 ?), *Miscellanies. Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, iv., 355; xii., 326, 379, 451, 452. Am. ed., ii.
6.—Irenæus. *Ib.*, i., 261; Am. ed., i.
7.—Tertullian. *Ib.*, ii., 408; xv., 25; xviii., 118; Am. ed., iii., iv.
8.—Origen. *Ib.*, xxiii., 1–3; Am. ed., iv.
9.—Hippolytus. *Ib.*, ix., 130.
10.—Peter of Alexandria (d. 311). *Ib.*, xiv., 305, 318.
11.—Caius of Rome (210?). Euseb., ii., 25; iii., 28; v., 28; vi., 20. *Ante-Nic. Fathers*, v.

II.—NON-CHRISTIAN:
1.—Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* Many eds.
2.—Socrates, *Eccl. Hist. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, ii., 109.
3.—Theodoret, *Letters.* No. 86. *Ib.*, iii., 282.
4.—Josephus and Philo. See Chap. IV.
5.—Heathen writers like Lucan, Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian. See Chaps. III. and IV.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:
1.—Allies, T. W., *St. Peter: His Name and His Office.* Lond., 1895.
2.—Allmatt, C. F. B., *Cathedra Petri.* Lond., 1884. *Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome?* Lond., 1887.
3.—Barnes, A. S., *St. Peter in Rome and His Tomb in the Vatican Hill.* Lond., 1900.
4.—Berington and Kirk, *Faith of the Catholics.* 3 vols. N. Y., 1885.
5.—Birks, H. A., *Studies in the Life and Character of St. Peter.* Lond., 1887.
6.—Bright, W., *The Roman See in the Early Church.* Lond., 1896.
7.—Brown, J. H., *Peter the Apostle never in Rome.* Lond., 1861.
8.—Bruce, A. B., *Training of the Twelve.* N. Y., 1871.
9.—Darby, W. A., *St. Peter at Rome.* Lond., 1872.

10.—Ellendorf, J., *St. Peter: Was He ever at Rome and a Bishop of the Church of Rome?* Lond., 1887.
11.—Fouard, C., *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity.* N. Y., 1892.
12.—Gallagher, M., *Was the Apostle Peter ever at Rome?* N. Y., 1894.
13.—Green, S. G., *The Apostle Peter: His Life and Letters.* Lond., 1873.
14.—Hatch, E., "Peter," *Encyc. Brit.*
15.—Hodder, E., *Simon Peter: His Life.* Lond., 1893.
16.—Kenrick, F. P., *The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated.* Phil., 1855.
17.—Lightfoot, J. B., *St. Peter in Rome. Clement*, ii., 481. Lond., 1890.
18.—Littledale, R. F., *The Petrine Claims.* N. Y., 1889.
19.—Livius, T., *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.* Lond., 1902.
20.—Murphy, J. N., *The Chair of St. Peter.* Lond., 1888.
21.—Puller, F. W., *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.* Lond., 1900.
22.—Ramsay, W. M., *The Church in the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1893.
23.—Rivington, L., *The Primitive Church and the See of St. Peter.* N. Y., 1894.
24.—Robins, S., *Against the Claims of the Roman Church.* Lond., 1853.
25.—Robinson, C. S., *Simon Peter: His Life and Times.* 2 vols. Lond., 1890–5.
26.—Ryberg, A. V., *Roman Legends about the Apostles Paul and Peter.* Lond., 1898.
27.—Simon, T. C., *The Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter.* Lond., 1852.

II.—GENERAL:

Alzog, i., 117–133. Backhouse, 76, 229. Bartlett, 297 ff., 364 ff. Blunt, i., 10, 24, 28, 43, 45. Bouzique, i., ch. 1. Brock, ch. 2, 3. Cheetham, ch. 2, § 5; ch. 4, § 5. Cox, i., ch. 10, 11. Darras, i., ch. 1–3. Döllinger, *First Age*, i., 71–83; ii., 115, 145; *Hist. of Ch.*, i., ch. 3, § 4. Duff, ch. 7. Farrar, bk. ii., ch. 5–11. Fisher, 18, 20, 23, 26,

43, 57, 106. Gibbon, ch. 9, 10. Gieseler, i., § 27. Giles, ch. 16. Gilmartin, i., ch. 2, pp. 28, 29. Greenwood, i., ch. 1–3. Hase, 30. Hurst, i., 104–106, 325. Jackson, ch. 3, 11. Jennings, i., ch. 1. Killen, § 1, ch. 10. Kurtz, i., 45. Mahan, bk. i., ch. 8. Milman, i., ch. 1. Milner, i., cent. 1, ch. 12. Moeller, i., 345. Neander, *Planting*, etc., i., bk. iv., ch. 2; *Ch. Hist.*, i., 84, 203, 211. Pressensé, *Early Years of Christ*, 10 ff., 64, 176. Renan, *The Apostles*, ch. 6. Robertson, bk. i., ch. 8, p. 160. Schaff, *Apost. Age*, bk. i., ch. 4; *Ch. Hist.*, pd. i., ch. 4. Stanley, *Apost. Age*, 1–5, 56–114. Walpole, ch. 1–3.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT'S TREATMENT OF THE CHRISTIANS

OUTLINE: I.—Religious persecutions before the Christian era. II.—Christians first persecuted by the Jews. III.—Causes and motives of persecution by the Roman government. IV.—Number and general character of the persecutions. V.—Results of persecutions. VI.—Sources.

RELIGIOUS persecution originated long before the Christian era began—in fact it runs through the whole history of religion. In Rome all citizens were required by law to conform to the Roman religion so that the gods would protect the state. Refusal brought punishment, but always on political grounds.[1] Foreign religions which were either harmless or helpful were often adopted, or at least tolerated.[2] Those, however, which were dangerous to public morality, social order, or political security, and which were not tolerant of other religions, were severely treated by the Roman government. This was the Roman legal principle of procedure in the case of every such religion,[3] hence when Christianity appeared,

[1] Hardy, 1–18.

[2] Examples: Cybele, Bellona, Magna Mater.

[3] Examples: Cult of Isis excluded from Rome 58 B.C. (Tertullian, *Apol.*). Temples of Isis and Serapis destroyed 50 B.C. (Dion Cassius, xi., 47). Repeated measures later. Jews expelled from Rome.

Rome had already developed a distinct policy which first tolerated and then persecuted it.

Persecution came to the Christians first from the Jews. Had not these deserters of their fathers' faith precipitated Roman hatred upon the Jews which resulted in persecution, expulsion, and loss of freedom and independence?[1] Might not the Jewish religion be greatly weakened if this proselyting continued? Hence the Christians were persecuted individually and in masses.[2] The Jews sought in every possible way to incite the Roman authorities against the hated Christians.[3] This resulted in an irreparable breach between the two sects. The Christians were brought into greater prominence, and the Romans even sought to protect them from the Jewish fanatics.[4] At the same time a greater Christian zeal was aroused, and thus the spread of the new faith was promoted.

The Roman government tolerated the Christians at the outset, because they were regarded as a harmless sect of Jews, whose work was quiet and unobtrusive.[5] The significance of Christianity was not understood, nor the marvellous spread of the faith noticed. Indeed Roman hostility to the Jews led at first to per-

[1] Neander, i., 89; Fisher, 30. Caligula, it seems, expelled the Jews from Rome; Claudius (41–54) first forbade their assembling (Dion Cassius, 60, 6) and then sought to drive them out of the capital (Orosius, *Hist.*, 7, 6.)

[2] For individuals like Stephen, Acts vii., 58; James, Acts xii., 2; Peter, Acts iv.; xii., 3; Paul, Acts ix., 23, 24; xiv., 5, 19; xvii., 13; xxiii., 12; xvi., 23; xxii., 24. For masses see Acts viii., 1–4; Acts xxvi., 10–12; Clement, *Recognitions*, i., ch. 53, 71; Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.*, ch. 36; *Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 16, 39, 96, 115.

[3] Hurst, i., 153.

[4] Acts, xviii., 14, 15; xxi., 31, 32; xxiv., 1–27; xxv., 14; xxvi., 32; Uhlhorn, 238.

[5] Origen, *Against Celsus*, iii., 1–3.

sonal and official protection of the supporters of the new faith, until the Jewish War in 70 A.D.

The Roman policy soon changed, however, from that of indifference, or protection, to persecution. The causes for this change are: (1) The political science of the Roman Empire, and (2) the inherent character of Christianity.

Ethically the Roman state embodied the highest good, hence all human good depended upon the integrity and security of the state. That principle subordinated the religious to the political, and made the Emperor the head of all recognised religions. Roman law upheld this theory, as clearly stated by Cicero: "No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself new or foreign gods, unless they are recognised by the public laws."[1] Julius Paulus, a Roman citizen, stated the idea thus: "Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men might be disturbed, should, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death." Gaius said of forbidden associations: "Neither a society, nor a college, nor any body of this kind, is conceded to all persons promiscuously; for this thing is regulated by laws, or codes of the Senate, and by imperial constitutions."[2] Hence from a legal standpoint Christianity was illegal, because it introduced a new religion not admitted into the class of *religiones licitæ*. "You are not permitted by the law," was the taunt of pagans.[3]

[1] *Concerning Laws*, i., pt. 2, ch. 8. This was also the ancient principle of the XII. Tables.

[2] Bk. iii., ch. 4, par. 1.

[3] See Tertullian and Celsus.

To organise churches and to hold unlicensed meetings were violations of Roman law. Might they not easily serve as covers for political plots? Mæcenas advised Augustus: "Worship the gods in all respects in accordance with the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same. But hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular . . . because such persons, by introducing new divinities, mislead many to adopt foreign laws. Hence conspiracies and secret combinations—the last things to be borne in a monarchy."[1] Roman citizens, therefore, who turned Christian were criminals, outlaws, bandits, and traitors; consequently the best Emperors, those who felt called upon to enforce the law for the weal of the Empire, those who wished to restore the vigour and power of old Rome, sought to exterminate them, while the worst rulers were mostly indifferent, and in some instances tolerant.

Christianity, inherently, was opposed to the whole governmental, social, and religious systems of Rome in the most offensive and uncompromising manner. It advocated one God for all men, one universal kingdom, one brotherhood of all men, and one plan of salvation. It was world-wide, above the Emperor, and advocated a non-Roman unity. The Christians were subjects of God's kingdom first, and the Emperor's next; and when Rome spurned this secondary allegiance they ceased to feel themselves Romans at all.[2] They refused the duties of loyal citizens, held no offices, objected to military service,[3] and refused

[1] Address reported by Dion Cassius.

[2] Ramsay, 356.

[3] Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christ. with Heathenism*, 231.

to sacrifice to the honour of the Emperor.[1] "Does not the Emperor punish you justly?" asked Celsus. "Should all do like you he would be left alone—there would be none to defend him. The rudest barbarians would make themselves masters of the world." Furthermore the Christians claimed the exclusive possession of divine knowledge and called all forms of pagan worship idolatrous.[2] Christianity itself was intolerant of all other religions. Was not Christianity the only true faith? How then could the Christians compromise with false faiths, or concede to them any truth, or any right to exist?[3] Hence it was inevitable, and Christians were keenly conscious of the fact, that a conflict should arise between Christianity and the Roman Empire, before the universal dominion of the world could come. The efforts of imperial officers to compromise matters, by insisting on mere outward conformity, met with little success.

The attack made by paganism on Christianity came first from Roman philosophers, scholars, and statesmen for all sorts of motives. Some desired popular favour, others were sincere, still others sought to win imperial approval. Many, no doubt, even though they had no longer any heart for the ancient faith, yet could not bear to see it abolished. They would agree with Cæcilius that "Since all nations agree to recognise the immortal gods, although their nature or their origin may be uncertain, I cannot endure that any one swelling with audacity and such irreligious knowledge should strive to dissolve or weaken a

[1] Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christ. with Heathenism*, 234.
[2] Gibbon, ii., bk. 3, ch. 16.
[3] Uhlhorn, 224; Moeller, i., 81.

religion so old, so useful, so salutary."[1] Tacitus called Christians "haters of mankind," and assailed their religion as a "destructive superstition."[2] Suetonius denounced the new faith as a "poisonous or malignant superstition." Others scoffed at these odd devotees as "dangerous infidels," "enemies of Cæsar and of the Roman people," and "a reprobate, unlawful, desperate faction." Priests, driven on by duty and possibly fearing the loss of their offices, added their sacred voices to the popular clamour.[3] Merchants and artists, whose livelihood depended upon the sale of their products and wares to pagan temples and worshippers, raised their voices against the new sect "without altars, without temples, without images, and without sacrifices."[4] Then the populace, incited by the above-named classes, took up the opposition and soon spread the wildest reports.[5]

Christians were also declared to be responsible for every disaster like war, famine, fire, pestilence, flood, earthquakes, death of prominent persons, etc. The gods, angered at the presence of such persons, sent these dire calamities[6] on the atheists, who denied the many gods and worshipped but one, and who discarded all images—even that of the Emperor.[7] Did they not adore the wood of a cross and worship

[1] *Octav.*, c. 8.

[2] *Annales*, xv., c. 44.

[3] Alzog, i., 257.

[4] Acts xix., 24 ff.; Pliny, *Ep.*, x., 97; Neander, i., 92.

[5] For a detailed statement of the accusations read the apologies of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Origen.

[6] Cyprian, *To Demetrianus*, 1; Origen, *Against Celsus*, iii., ch. 16; Tertullian, *Apol.*, ch. 40; *To Nations*, 9; Alzog, i., 261.

[7] Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., ch. 6, 13, 17; Arnobius, *Against Gentes*, iii., ch. 28.

the head of an ass?[1] Did they not refuse to conform to all religious observances and festivals? Who but dangerous conspirators would hold their meetings in secret at night? These anarchists who refused all civic service[2]; these social revolutionists who broke up family ties,[3] set slave against master, taught robbery under the guise of equality, refused to enjoy the social games and festivals, and interfered with business; these cannibals who ate the flesh and drank the blood of their infants, the offspring of their incestuous and adulterous carousals—what punishment could be too severe for such degenerates? Were they not a Jewish sect which had deserted the faith of their fathers, and which could command respect neither for age nor legality?[4]

The occasion for the inevitable war between the Roman sword and the Christian cross was popular hatred and ridicule, and the frequent outbreaks of the mobs. The fundamental cause was political necessity, for the Christians were guilty of *crimen læsæ majestatis*, high treason. Christianity in the

[1] A crucifix with the head of an ass and body of a man was actually dug up in Rome and is now exhibited in a museum there. In Tertullian's day there was circulated a picture of a man with the ears of an ass, clothed in a toga, holding a book, and with these words beneath: "The God of the Christians" (*Apol.*, 16; *Ad. Nat.*, 11, 14; Tacitus, *Hist.*, v., 3). In the Palace of the Cæsars a rough sketch of a crucified man with an ass's head was found (*Hist. Photographs*, No. 107, Oxf., 1870; *Univ. Quart.*, July, 1879, p. 338).

[2] Origin, *Against Celsus*, viii., ch. 75; *Apol.*, ch. 29, 35, and 39; Tertullian, *Concerning Idol.*, ch. 17; *De Cor. Mil.*, i., c. 15.

[3] *Cf.* Luke, xxi., 16.

[4] Hence all the hatred and prejudice of the Romans for the Jews were turned against the Christians. Gibbon, ii., 6; Gieseler, i., p. 101.

Roman Empire was somewhat like anarchy to-day in the United States in its relation to the state. The technical charges made against the Christians were: (1) introducing a *religio illicita*, for which the penalty was death or banishment; (2) committing *læsa majestas*, for which the penalty was loss of social rank, outlawry, or death by sword, fire, or wild beasts; (3) being guilty of *sacrilegium*, for which the penalty was death by crucifixion, the ax, or wild beasts; (4) practising magic, for which the penalty was crucifixion, or exposure to wild beasts in the circus.

Both the number and character of the persecutions seem to be misunderstood. The Church Fathers and many later historians magnify the number, fierceness, and duration of the persecutions, and the number killed.[1] On the contrary it seems that considerable time elapsed before the Christians were noticed by the government, which then proceeded against them with caution and reluctance and punished them in comparative moderation.[2] The Church enjoyed many seasons of rest and peace. The number of Christians killed during the entire period of persecution was comparatively small.[3] The persecutions varied with the whims and feelings of each Emperor—the best rulers like Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Decius, and Diocletian, feeling the necessity of upholding the law, were the most energetic persecutors, while the worst Emperors were indifferent, or even favourable. The early persecutions were only spasmodic outbreaks and limited; the later ones were general. There is no

[1] Origen declared that the number of Christian martyrs was small and easily counted. *Celsum*, c. 3.

[2] Gibbon, ii., ch. 16; Uhlhorn, 234, 235.

[3] Moeller, i., 193.

reason for giving ten as the number of the persecutions —nor for comparing them with the ten plagues of Egypt.

The first persecution occurred in Rome under Nero in 64 A.D.[1] Some historians contend that the Neronian persecution fell upon the Jews, whom Tacitus, writing fifty years after the event, erroneously calls Christians.[2] Others maintain that the Jews, through court influence, shifted the punishment from themselves to the Christians.[3] Recent scholars, however, are inclined to accept the literal narrative of Tacitus.[4] According to his version of the situation, the persecution was accidental — a device of Nero to divert the suspicion directed against himself of having burned Rome — and local, that is, it did not extend to the provinces. A few Christians were tortured and compelled to confess themselves guilty of incendiarism and to give the names of others, and that led to the punishment of an "ingens multitudo" as Nero's scapegoats.[5] As a punishment for their alleged crime of incendiarism and "hatred for the human race," they were covered with the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by the dogs in the circus, crucified by day, and burned as torches by

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv., 44. It seems to be very probable that persecutions by the Roman government occurred earlier than this. 1 Pet.; Rev. ii., 13; xx., 4.

[2] Schiller, Lipsius, and Hausrath.

[3] Notably Merivale.

[4] Hardy, Uhlhorn, Ramsay, Allard, and Harnack.

[5] E. Th. Klette, *Nero and the Christians*, who relies for his conclusions on sources prior to Tacitus, repudiates the scapegoat theory. He contends that Nero, influenced by Jewish intrigue, publicly punished the Christians as Christians and because of the popular suspicions against them, so as to make it appear that the burning of Rome was due to the wrath of the gods.

night.[1] Paul, in all likelihood, fell a victim to this persecution and the Roman Church has always believed that Peter also perished at this time.[2]

As a result, the attention of the Roman government was directed to these "haters of the human race," and they became branded as outlaws and brigands. Popular fury ran riot. A precedent was established, both in Rome and the provinces, for punishing Christians for the name alone.[3] Nevertheless sympathy was won for them, they secretly increased in numbers, and were compelled to adopt a better organisation in order to resist oppression. Above everything else the striking difference between the Kingdom of God and the Empire of Cæsar was strongly marked on the Christian conscience.

After Nero's persecution, under the Flavian Emperors (68–96), there was a standing law against Christianity, like that against brigandage, but it was only occasionally enforced.[4] There is no positive proof of persecution under Vespasian (69–79). Titus (79–81), however, continued the policy of Nero.[5] Under Domitian (81–96) there was increased severity in both Rome and the provinces. This may have been occasioned in part by the fact that as a result of the Jewish War all toleration for the Jews was withdrawn. Christians were now classed with the hated Jews. Flavius Clemens, the Emperor's cousin, was executed

[1] Juvenal, *Sat.*, i., 155 ff.; Seneca, *Ep.*, 14; Clement, *To Corinth*, 6; Euseb., ii., c. 25; Orosius, vii., c. 7. *Cf.* Ramsay, *Ch. in Rom. Emp.* 226 ff.

[2] Sulp. Severus, *Chron.* ii., c. 29; *Transl. and Ref.*, iv., 6.

[3] Mommsen, Sandy, Hardy, Ramsay.

[4] Mommsen, v., 523 n.

[5] Sulp. Severus, *Chron.*, ii., c. 30, 6; *Transl. and Ref.*, iv., 6–8.

and his beautiful wife Domitilla was banished.[1] Many others were killed, compelled to fight wild beasts in the arena, or at least lost their property.[2] It was even reported that Domitian planned to have all the relatives of Jesus slain in order to prevent the rise of a possible rival in the east.[3]

Of "the Five Good Emperors" (96–180) who succeeded the Flavian rulers, three continued the policy of persecution. The first, Nerva (96–98), was tolerant to the Christians. The next Emperor, Trajan (98–117), one of the best Emperors, was not a wanton persecutor,[4] but felt it to be his duty to uphold the laws and religion of the Empire.[5] He was really the first Emperor to proceed against Christianity from a purely legal point of view. By this time Christianity was clearly recognised as a distinct sect and its real significance appreciated. His policy may be clearly seen in his correspondence with Pliny, the governor of Bithynia (112).[6] No doubt his views were influenced by Tacitus and Pliny, who regarded Christianity as a "bad and immoderate superstition." Still under Trajan persecution was limited to Bithynia,

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., c. 18; Dion Cass., lxvii., c. 14; Suet., *Dom.*, c. 15; *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., 6.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iv., 26.

[3] Hegesippus, quoted in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., c. 20; Tertullian; Clement of Rome, *1st Epistle.*

[4] Melito of Sardica (c. 170), Lactantius, Eusebius, and the mediæval writers generally held that he was rather favourable to Christians.

[5] Gieseler, Aubé, Overbeek, Uhlhorn Keim, and Renan held that Trajan began a new era unfavourable to Christians but Lightfoot, Hardy, and Ramsay explain it on the ground of political expediency.

[6] Pliny wrote sixty letters to Trajan and Trajan made forty-eight replies. These have all been translated into English. Read letters 96 and 97. See *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 8.

Jerusalem, and Antioch, although Christianity had been formally proscribed everywhere, together with all secret societies. His attitude was the model for persecutions of the second century and later.[1]

Hadrian (117–138), who apparently judged Christianity rather trivially, issued the famous rescript which forbade riotous proceedings, on the one hand, and malicious information against the Christians on the other: "If any one, therefore, accuses them and shows that they are doing anything contrary to the laws, do you pass judgment according to the crime. But, by Hercules! if any one bring an accusation through mere calumny, decide in regard to his criminality and see to it that you inflict punishment."[2] Hadrian's adopted son and successor, Antoninus Pius (138–161), a wise, upright ruler, interfered to protect Christians at Athens and Thessalonica. His edict, given in Eusebius, is probably spurious, though the spirit may be correct.[3] Marcus Aurelius (161–180), an educated Stoic and an excellent Emperor, encouraged persecution against those guilty of "sheer obstinacy." Public calamities had again aroused the mob against the Christians. The imperial decree, "not fit to be executed even against barbarous enemies," authorised the use of torture to discover Christians and to compel them to recant, and also ordered the confiscation of property. This order to seek out

[1] For an excellent discussion of the significance of the Trajan prosecutions, see Ramsay, *Ch. in Rom. Emp.*, 190–225.

[2] Authenticity of this document is doubted by Baur, Klein, Lipsius, Overbeek, Aubé, McGiffert, etc., but defended by Ramsay, Lightfoot, Mommsen, Allard, Funk, Ranke, Uhlhorn, Moeller, etc. See *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 10.

[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iv., c. 13, 26; Tertullian; Harnack, article on Pius in Herzog-Hauck, *Real Encyc.*

Christians, and not await formal complaints, seems to mark a new step in imperial legislation. Still persecution was not general, but confined to Lyons and Vienne in southern Gaul, and to Asia Minor.[1]

The period from 180 to 249 saw no essential changes.[2] Persecutions were merely local, and depended more upon provincial feeling and the character of the governor, than on the Emperor. Some of the Emperors were friendly to the new religion, others quite hostile. Commodus (180–193), dissolute, timid, and cruel, was friendly to the Christians owing, probably, to the influence of his favourite concubine, Marcia, who may have been a Christian.[3] Septimus Severus (193–211), an able soldier, was indifferent to the new faith up to 202, when he issued a rescript forbidding pagans from becoming Christians, and enforced the old Trajan law with considerable severity.[4] Caracalla (211–217) and Heliogabalus (218–222), two of the most contemptible Roman rulers, both tolerated Christianity. The former recalled banished Christians; the latter sought to merge Christianity into his own elective system of religion. Alexander Severus (222–235) actually gave Christianity a place in his cosmopolitan faith, had a bust of Jesus set up in his private chapel, allowed churches to be built, and protected the Christ-

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, v., c. 1; *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 11.

[2] This period saw seventeen different Emperors.

[3] See Eusebius on this reign, *Eccl. Hist.*, v., c. 9–24.

[4] Clement of Alexandria wrote: "Many martyrs are daily burned, crucified, and beheaded before our eyes." Origen's father was among them. At Scillite in Numidia 200 suffered. *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p 20. At Carthage two young women were given to wild beasts. Tertullian refers to other persecutions. Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., c. 1, 7.

ians. But Christianity was not legalised. On the contrary, Ulpian, the great jurist, collected for public use in case of need all the imperial laws against the new faith.[1] Maximinus the Thracian (235–238), a coarse, brutal, military leader, ordered that all officers of the churches should be "put to death as responsible for the gospel teaching."[2] Philip the Arabian (244–248) was reported to be a Christian—at all events Christians were not punished during his rule.[3]

The last period of persecution (249–311) was characterised by civil and moral decline in the Empire and by the amazing growth of Christianity, which had become bold and aggressive. It must either be exterminated, or else adopted as the state religion. Hence the Emperors, who sought to restore the old power and splendour of ancient Rome, showed the greatest severity. Decius (249–251) issued the first edict of universal persecution (250) as a political necessity.[4] Local officials, under the threat of severe penalties, were required to compel all Christians to conform to the state religion. Christians might flee, but their property was confiscated and their return meant death. The inquisitorial process was employed and penalties were severe, especially for the leaders.[5] Decius declared that he would rather hear of the rise of a rival Emperor than of the appointment

[1] Moeller, i., 191.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., c. 28; Origen, *On Martyrdom.*

[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., c. 34.

[4] The text of this decree has been lost. Two later decrees were issued—the first exiling Church officers, the second condemning them to death. See Gregg, *The Decian Persecution.*

[5] Read Cyprian, *Concerning the Lapsed*, iii., c. 8, for the most vivid account; *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 21.

of a Roman bishop.[1] Valerian (253–260) was said at first to be "mild and friendly toward the men of God,"[2] but public disasters and the advice of his friends led him to renew the persecutions, so he issued an edict in 257 commanding Christians to conform to the state religion on pain of banishment. The assembly of Christians was forbidden,[3] and the bishops were banished. The next year he promulgated a second decree more sanguinary than that of Decius, because it condemned all bishops, priests, and deacons to death.[4] Gallienus (260–268) recalled the exiled Christians, restored their church property, and forbade further persecution,[5] but Aurelian (270–275) ordered the old laws enforced with renewed vigour.[6] His death, however, prevented the execution of the order; and thus the Christians had about forty years of peace.

Under Diocletian (284–305), a warrior statesman, occurred the last, longest, and harshest persecution.[7] It was mildest in the West and worst in Syria and Egypt, and endured ten years. This Emperor, apparently, took up the sword very reluctantly. In 287 he issued a decree against the Manichæans in Egypt which was a general condemnation of Christianity. In 295 all soldiers were ordered to sacrifice on pain of expulsion, or, in obstinate cases, execution. In 303 Christians were accused of burning the imperial palace at Nicomedia and suffered accordingly. An

[1] Cyprian, *Ep. to Antonian.*
[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vii., c. 10; Gregg, *The Decian Persecution.*
[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vii., c. 11.
[4] Cyprian, *Ep.*, 81; *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, 20, 22, 23.
[5] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vii., c. 13 ff.
[6] *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 26.
[7] Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian.*

imperial edict commanded the churches to "be razed to the ground, the Scriptures destroyed by fire," Christian officials degraded, Christian servants enslaved, bishops imprisoned and forced to sacrifice, and torture employed to compel Christians to conform.[1] Everywhere these laws were executed, Eusebius says, with great severity until checked by the edict of limited toleration by Galerius and his coregents in 311,[2] and stopped by the decree of complete toleration granted by Constantine in 313[3] after a glorious struggle of 250 years.

The results of the persecutions were very marked and have been both exaggerated and ignored:

1. The growth of Christianity was helped rather than hindered. Persecution advertised the new belief and won sympathy. It created an intense devotion to the cause, proved the truth of the religion, and made a martyr's crown desirable. Tertullian exclaimed: "Go on! rack, torture, grind us to powder; our members increase in proportion as you mow us down. The blood of Christians is their harvest seed. Your very obstinacy is a teacher. For who is not incited by a consideration of it to enquire what there is in the core of the matter? And who, after having joined us, does not long to suffer?" The period of persecution ended with a conquest of the Emperor and a large part of the Empire. The victory was thus a double one.

2. The organisation of the Church was effected. Persecution forced the Church to organise itself more

[1] *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 26; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, viii.–x.; Uhlhorn, 407.

[2] *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 28; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, viii., 17.

[3] *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 1, p. 29.

efficiently, produced responsible leaders, who were forced to direct the struggle against Rome and who, as a result, were given pre-eminence by special punishment, and developed the monarchio-episcopal system. The extraordinary development of the power of the Bishop of Rome, in particular, was influenced to a far greater degree than is ordinarily taken into account. Much emphasis has been laid on the fact that that epoch of outlawry ended by the adoption of Christianity by the Empire. A much more important result, however, is found in the fact that Christianity, for weal or woe, adopted the Roman Empire.

3. The Church was kept purer in belief and more united in form. The spiritual was magnified over the temporal. Common oppression joined Christians in common sympathy. The differences between Christianity and paganism were emphasised. With death over their heads the Christians thought little of life here but much of that hereafter and regulated their lives accordingly. Still the growing consciousness that the Church was a world-wide institution must have been powerfully stimulated. With the evolution of the idea of Christian unity appeared the conspicuous leadership of the Roman Church. Irenæus (d. 202) could declare that it was "a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its pre-eminent authority." Tertullian (c. 220) also recognised the distinction of the Roman Church, though later he questioned the validity of the Petrine claim. It was left to Cyprian (d. 258) to give the first complete account of the Universal or Catholic Church in his work on the *Unity of the Church*.

4. Persecution produced a group of extraordinary literary defenders like the apologists, controversialists, and letter writers, and helped to develop the fundamental, orthodox Christian doctrine. It also produced much legendary poetry; and out of this baptism of blood was created the heroic age of the Church, based partly on fact and partly on fiction.

5. The forms of worship were modified, the worship of saints and relics was originated, and the priesthood was sanctified and set above the laity.

6. An example was furnished for later persecutions of the pagans, Mohammedans, Jews, and heretics.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—CHRISTIAN.

1—**New Testament.**

2.—**Church Fathers.**

1.—Clement, *Ep. to Cor.*, ch. 5–7. Lightfoot, Lond., 1891.

2.—Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.*, ch. 5, 24, 31, 52. 2 *Apol.*, ch. 2, 8. *Dialog. with Trypho*, ch. 110. *Ante-Nic. Lib.*, ii., 1, 2, 79.

3.—Athenagoras, *Plea for the Christians*, ch. 1–4, 12, 31. *Ib.*, ii., 375.

4.—Minucius Felix, *The Octavius*. *Ib.*, 451–571.

5.—Severus, *Sacred Hist.*, ii., ch. 28–33. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers* xi.

6.—Tertullian, *To Scapulam*, ch. 4. *Ib.*, ii., 49–51. *Apology*, ch. 2–16. *Ib.*, 55–84.

7.—Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, v., ch. 1, 9, 11. *Ib.*, xxii., 92, 93, 98, 99. *About the Death of Persecutors*, ch. 4, 7. *Ib.*, xxii., 167, 168, 170.

8.—Origen, *Against Celsus*, i., ch. 3. *Ib.*, x., 400.

9.—Cyprian, *Epistle* 80; *To Demetrianus*, ch. 17. *Ib.*, viii., 436.

10.—Irenæus, *Fragments*, ch. 13. *Ib.*, x., 164, 165.

11.—Hippolytus, *Christ and Antichrist*, ch. 56, 60. *Ib.*, ix., 34, 35.
12.—Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* Various eds.

II.—HEATHEN WRITERS.

1.—Tacitus, *Annals*, xi., 15; xv., 38–44.
2.—Juvenal, *First Satire*, verse 155 ff.
3.—Suetonius, *Hist. of the Twelve Cæsars.* Tiberius, ch. 36; Claudius, ch. 25, 5; Nero, ch. 16, 38; Domitian, ch. 12. Bohn.
4.—Dion Cassius, *Hist. of Rome.* Xiphilin's *Abridgment* in Eng. 2 vols. 1704.
5.—Pliny, *Letters*, x., 96, 97. Transl. by Lewis, Lond., 1879.
6.—Aurelius, *Meditations.*, xi., 3. Bohn, 1869.
7.—Celsus, *Against the Christians.* Eng. transl., Lond., 1869.
8.—Lucian, *The Death of Perigrinus.* Transl. by Tooke. Lond., 1820.

3.—**Collections.**

1.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints*, iv., No. 1.
2.—Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, i.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Addis, W. E., *Christianity in the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1893.
2.—Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints.* N. Y., 1873–7.
3.—Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1903.
4.—Butler, A., *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints.* Dub., 1866.
5.—Carr, A., *The Church and the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1886.
6.—Casy, J., *Trials and Triumphs of the Church.* Dub., 1899.
7.—Castelloe, B. F. C., *The Church and the Catacombs.* Lond., 1894.
8.—Croke, A. D., *The Church and the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1890.
9.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *Hippolytus and Callistus.* Edinb., 1876. *First Age of Christianity.* Lond., 1877.

10.—Gregg, J. A. F., *The Decian Persecutions.* Edinb., 1897.
11.—Hardy, E. G., *Christianity and the Roman Government.* Lond., 1894.
12.—Healy, P. J., *The Valerian Persecution.* N. Y., 1905.
13.—Lightfoot, J. B., *St. Clement of Rome,* i., 69–81. *Ignatius,* i., 69.
14.—Mason, A. J., *The Diocletian Persecution.* Lond., 1876.
15.—Newton, R., *Heroes of the Early Church.* Lond., 1889.
16.—Oxenham, H. N., *Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Biography.* Lond., 1884. 27–56.
17.—Perram, A. F., *Stories about the Early Christians.* Lond., 1887.
18.—Pressensé, E. de, *The Martyrs and Apologists.* N. Y., 1873. i., ch. 2–14.
19.—Ramsay, W. M., *The Church in the Roman Empire.* N. Y., 1893.
20.—Rankin, J., *The First Saints.* Lond., 1893.
21.—Renan, E. *Marcus Aurelius. Antichrist.*
22.—Spence, H. D. M., *Early Christianity and Paganism.* N. Y. and Lond., 1902.
23.—Steere, E., *Persecutions of the Early Church.* Lond., 1880.
24.—Uhlhorn, G., *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.* N. Y., 1879.
25.—Watson, F., *Defenders of the Faith.* Lond., 1888.
26.—Workman, H. B., *Persecution in the Early Church.* Lond., 1906.

II.—GENERAL:

Alzog, i., sec. 48, 64–70. Backhouse, pt. 2, ch. 2–8. Bartlett, ch. 2. Baur, ii., 215–221. Bouzique, i., ch. 3. Burton, ch. 2, 5, 7–11, 13, 16, 17. Butler, ch. 6.–8. Chantrel, ch. 3. Cheetham, ch. 3, sec. 1. Clarke, ch. 1, 2. Coxe, ch. 2, sec. 27. Croke, ch. 1–10. Crooks, ch. 14. Darras, i., ch. 1–14. Döllinger, i., ch. 1, sec. 9, 10. Duff, ch. 11, 13, 15, 16, 22–25, 30. Fisher, pd. 2, ch. 1. Foulks, ch. 1–3. Gieseler, i., 119. Gilmartin, i., ch. 5. Guericke, 77–102. Hase, 42–55. Hore, ch. 3. Hurst, i., 161–179. Jackson, ch.

2–3. Jennings, i., ch. 2–3. Knight, ch. 2–5. Kurtz, i., sec. 21, 22. Merivale, 6–8. Milman, bk. i., ch. 1. Milner, i., cent. 2–4. Moeller, i., 74, 82, 159, 190. Neander, i., 86. Newman, i., 147. Robertson, bk. i., ch 1–3, 5–7. Schaff, ii., 31 ff.

CHAPTER VII

TRANSITION OF THE CHURCH UNDER CONSTANTINE

OUTLINE: I.—Condition of the Empire in 300. II.—How Constantine became Emperor. III.—Constantine's conversion to Christianity. IV.—Constantine's favours to Christianity. V.—Constantine's character. VI.—Constantine's historical significance. VII.—Sources.

TO understand the great changes that took place in the Christian Church under Constantine, it is necessary to keep distinctly in mind both the status of Christianity, on the one hand, and the general conditions of the Empire, on the other.

In territorial extent the Empire still formed a huge fringe around the Mediterranean Sea and had lost but little of its vastness under Trajan (98–117). Under Diocletian (284–305) the Empire became an undisguised oriental despotism. The administration was divided between two Augusti, each of whom had an associate, called Cæsar. This division of rule, with its increased expense, aroused much jealousy and discontent, and greatly weakened the Empire. As many as six rival Emperors appeared at once, and out of the rivalry emerged Constantine the Great as the sole ruler of the Empire. Wars with the Persians in the east and with the barbarians on the north accelerated the declining political morality. At the same time social classes became more marked, and moral standards lower. Schools were neglected, literature became

superficial, poetry lost its voice, and oratory declined. Paganism, largely a form of patriotism and national festivity, still numbered many adherents, but it was not deeply rooted in their hearts.

Christianity, in the face of outlawry and severe persecution, had spread steadily and marvellously, and particularly among the substantial people of the Empire.[1] It is difficult to estimate the number of Christians because few records were left and the number of real believers was much larger than the professed adherents. The earlier estimates are probably too low. After more careful investigation, 30,000,000 may be safely given as indicating the numerical strength of the new creed.[2] When Constantine the Great appeared, therefore, old pagan Rome was declining, while a new Christian Rome was rapidly rising. Christianity would undoubtedly have gained the victory sooner or later had Constantine not appeared as its champion.

Constantine was born about 274 at Naïssus, in Upper Moesia. His father was Constantius Chlorus, a nephew of Emperor Claudius, the conqueror of the Goths, who was selected as Cæsar of the West possibly because of his imperial connection. His mother was Helena, the daughter of an innkeepea, and not the fabled English princess. She was only a concubine, who, however, was made a legal wife after the birth of Constantine.[3] She was a Christian, it seems, and

[1] Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 95–163; Ramsay, *Ch. in Rom. Emp.*, 57.

[2] Orr, *Neglected Factors*, 23–91.

[3] Zosimus, ii., 8; St. Ambrose, Migne, iii., 1209. For the fable about the English princess read Geoffrey of Monmouth and Pierre de Langloft. This tale was used by Baronius. It must be remembered that concubinage was a state recognised by Roman law, and was by no means in itself a sign of depravity.

no doubt taught the new faith to both her husband and son.[1]

Constantine's education was gained mostly in court circles and on the battle-field. As a boy he was instructed in the schools of Drepanum in Cilicia, his mother's birthplace, later changed to Helenapolis. Little is known about this phase of his training, and there are reasons for believing that it was not very comprehensive. In 292, when Constantine was eighteen, his father became Cæsar of the West, divorced his mother, and sent him to be educated as a sort of hostage at the court of Diocletian at Nicomedia. There he acquired his preliminary military training and political education. With Diocletian he made an expedition to Egypt *via* Palestine (296) and the next year joined Galerius in a campaign against the Persians. He soon won a reputation as a bold warrior, and became a popular leader. Indeed his superior ability aroused the jealousy of Galerius, who purposely exposed him to the gravest dangers, thus hoping to get rid of him. After his military success, he was made tribune of the first rank. Skilled in the art of politics at the court of the Eastern rulers, and having won his spurs in battle, he expected to be elevated to the office of Cæsar, when Diocletian resigned in 305, but was defeated by Galerius, who succeeded Diocletian as Augustus, and chose his own nephew as Cæsar. This was a keen disappointment to young Constantine.[2]

In 305, Constantius Chlorus succeeded Maximian, who had resigned by agreement with Diocletian, as

[1] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, iii., ch. 47, leads one to believe that Constantine converted his mother to Christianity. *Cf.* Hamza Ispaheus, p. 55.

[2] Lactantius, *Death of Persecutors*, ch. 24.

Augustus of the West, and, since there was no reason why an Augustus should leave his son as hostage at the court of an equal, he demanded the return of Constantine. Galerius reluctantly consented, but before the official permit was executed, Constantine, fearing treachery, fled at night, maimed the post-horses to prevent pursuit, and reached Boulogne just in time to go with his father to Britain.[1]

After an easy conquest of Britain, Constantius Chlorus died at York (July, 306), having named his son as his successor, whereupon the soldiers immediately saluted Constantine as Augustus.[2] Although this was the ancient practice, and Constantine was eligible for the office both by heredity and by preparation, still, constitutionally, the nomination rested with Galerius, who, enraged at the usurpation, and also at Constantine's shrewd diplomatic letter, allowed him only the title of Cæsar.[3] No man in the Empire was better fitted by age, appearance, previous training, and ability, for the higher office. Backed by his army, Constantine continued his father's policy to defend the Gauls against the Franks and Germans, and to develop the prosperity of the country. He married Maximian's daughter (307) as a diplomatic precaution and was recognised by him as Augustus. Meanwhile Maxentius, the son of Maximian, who, discovered in conspiracy, had committed suicide, had assumed the imperial purple at Rome and now took his father's death as a pretext for war against Constantine.[4] Encouraged by a Roman

[1] Zos., ii., 8; Euseb., *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 121.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, viii., ch. 13; *Life of Const.*, ii., ch. 22.

[3] Lactantius, *Death of Persecutors*, ch. 25. Galerius recognised Severus as Augustus of the West.

[4] Galerius meanwhile was induced to recognise Constantine as Augustus in 308.

embassy, Constantine at once hastily marched toward Rome and at Milvian Bridge defeated his rival, who was drowned in the Tiber (312). Constantine was now sole Emperor of the West. In 324 Licinius was defeated in the East and Constantine had become Emperor of the united Roman Empire.

Constantine's connection with Christianity marks a new epoch in the history of the Church. Under him the new faith was legalised, emancipated, protected, and given lands and buildings. Constantine's mother, who was a Christian, probably gave him his first favourable impressions of the outlawed religion. As a boy he must have heard it discussed as a topic for both light and serious conversation. At the court of Diocletian and Galerius he saw the edict of persecution proclaimed in 303 and must have witnessed the action of Christians under martyrdom, noticed their marvellous growth in the face of outlawry and punishment, and perhaps came to look with some favour upon their teachings. When he succeeded his father as Emperor of the West, he continued his father's policy of toleration and let Diocletian's edict of persecution fall as a dead letter.[1]

Tradition tells us that Constantine was converted to Christianity suddenly by a miracle. One day, during the conflict with Maxentius at Milvian Bridge, he and his whole army saw a bright cross in the heavens with this inscription in Greek on it: "In this sign, conquer." In a dream that night Christ appeared to him and commanded him to use the emblem of the cross as his battle ensign, and promised him victory in consequence. Constantine immediately had the

[1] Lactantius, *Death of Persecutors*, ch. 24; Euseb., *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 14, 16, 17, 27.

costly *labarum* made to be carried before his army and with it at Milvian Bridge, ten miles from Rome, he vanquished his foe.[1]

Three theories have been proposed to explain the spectacle of the cross: 1. That it was a genuine miracle, supported by the following facts: (a) Eusebius, who gives us the first account, had all the evidence directly from Constantine himself under oath; (b) Constantine's whole army "witnessed the miracle and put the emblem on their shields"[2]; (c) Socrates says the original standard could still be seen in his day.[3] The older historians all upheld the miracle, although few scholars to-day take that view.[4] 2. That it was a natural phenomenon coloured by Constantine's imagination, or an optical illusion, or a dream.[5] 3. That it was a pious fraud, deliberately invented either by Constantine, or by Eusebius.[6] Whatever the theories may be, the fact remains that for some reason Constantine invoked the aid of the Christian's God, and carried the Christian emblem in front of his troops to one victory after another until he became sole ruler of the Empire. If it was merely experimenting with the

[1] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 28–31; Sozomen, i., ch. 3; Socrates, i., ch. 2; Lactantius, *Death of Persecutors*, ch. 44.

[2] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 28; Sozomen, i., ch. 3.

[3] Socrates, i., ch. 2.

[4] Döllinger; J. H. Newman; Guericke, Uhlhorn, etc.

[5] Supported by best modern critical writers like Schroeck, Neander, Gieseler, Mansi, Milman, Keim, Heinicken, Schaff, Harnack, etc. For like examples see Whymper, *Scrambles among the Alps*, ch. 22; Gieseler, i., §56; Stanley, 288; Peary, *Narrative of an Attempt to Reach the North Pole*, 99, 100; Seymour, *The Cross in Tradition*, 103 *ff.*

[6] This theory is defended by Gibbon, Lardner, Waddington, Burckhardt, Hoornbeeck, Thomasius, Arnold, etc. They seem to ignore all proofs.

name and cross of Jesus, the experiment brought convincing belief, for the sacred emblem was employed in all later military campaigns.

The triumph over Maxentius at Milvian Bridge was a great victory for Christianity. Constantine had a statue of himself with a cross in his hands set up in Rome. An inscription on it stated that through Christianity the glory and freedom of Rome had been restored.[1] Henceforth Constantine extended imperial aid and protection to the Christians and a new era was opened in the history of the Christian Church. He endowed and enlarged Christian churches in Rome and later elsewhere[2]; he wrote letters in behalf of Christians in Africa[3]; he made Christian bishops, like Hosius, Lactantius, and Eusebius, his trusted political advisers; and he enacted laws legalising the new faith and protecting its adherents.

The edict of limited toleration passed by Galerius in 311, in conjunction with Constantine and Licinius, was very unsatisfactory. The Christians might rebuild their churches but were required to pray for the Emperor.[4] A decided preference was shown to paganism since no person was free to leave his own religion and join another. This was a great hardship, for many Romans were Christians at heart and were only waiting for permission to join the new Church openly.[5] To meet the new conditions and to afford the needed relief, Constantine, jointly with Licinius,

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ix., ch. 9; *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 40. The triumphal arch was not set up till 315.

[2] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, i., ch. 42.

[3] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, x., ch. 5, 7.

[4] Ibid., *Eccl. Hist.*, viii., 17; edict given in *Transl. and Reprints*, iv., No. 1, p. 28. *Cf.* Lactantius, ch. 34, 35.

[5] Neander, ii., 12, 13.

in 313 issued the Edict of Milan, the Magna Charta of religious liberty. It was promulgated in Greek and Latin over the whole Empire as imperial law. It did not make Christianity the state religion, as is generally asserted, but only legalised it, and popularised it. Now people could and did openly desert the old and join the new faith. Persecutions were forbidden under severe penalties. Exiles were recalled. Confiscated property was restored with compensation to the possessor. All Romans were exhorted to worship the Christian God. This famous edict was significant, because it put Christianity on an equality with paganism; gave it opportunity for public organisation, thus paving the way for the Catholic hierarchy already begun; and marks a new era in the history of the Christian Church, because at last a great Roman Emperor and his conquering army had taken up the sword in defence of persecuted Christianity.[1]

The proclamation of emancipation and protection was followed by other acts which clearly show that Constantine meant to favour and control the new religion. The Christian clergy were exempted from military and municipal duties[2]—a favour already enjoyed by pagan priests and even Jewish rabbis (March, 313). The Church Council of Arles was convoked (314). The emancipation of Christian slaves was facilitated (315). Various customs and ordinances offensive to Christians were abolished (316). Bequests to churches

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, x., 5. The Edict of Milan is given in *Transl. and Reprints*, iv., No. 1, p. 29. It is thought by some that the Edict of Milan refers to an edict issued by Constantine in 312 but now lost. That possibility seems very doubtful. *Cf.* Lactantius, ch. 48.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, x., ch. 7; Sozom., i., 9; Cod. Theod., xvi., 2, 1, 2, 3.

were legalised (321). The cessation of civic business on Sunday was enjoined, but as a "dies Solis" (321).[1] The heathen symbols of Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, and Hercules were removed from imperial coins (323). In defeating Licinius (324), a bitter reactionist, Constantine felt that he was waging war in behalf of Christianity.[2] In 324 Constantine issued a general exhortation to all Romans to embrace the new creed for the common weal. The highest dignities were opened to Christians. Gifts and remission of taxes enriched their churches. A craze for buildings led to the erection of churches at various sacred spots in the Holy Land, at Nicomedia, in Constantinople, in Rome, and elsewhere. Fifty costly manuscripts of the Bible were ordered prepared for the leading churches. The Council of Nicæa was held in 325, the Arian schism healed, and the first written creed given the Church. Finally, by divine command, as it was said, Constantine removed his capital from old pagan Rome to Byzantium, the new Christian Rome, which was renamed Constantinople (326). This left Christianity in the West, already strong and active, to organise itself under the guidance of the Bishop of Rome, and powerfully aided the evolution of the papal hierarchy. In the East, under imperial protection, the spread and organisation of the popular belief was phenomenal.

Paganism was still legal, however; its institutions were not attacked and the privileges of its priests were confirmed. Nevertheless the triumphs of Christianity were all won at the expense of paganism. As the new faith arose the old sank, yet not without many a

[1] Cod. Justin., iii., tit. 12, 1, 3.

[2] Moeller, i., 298. He at once issued edicts of toleration for Christians in the East. Euseb., *Life of Const.*, ii., ch. 24 *ff.*

desperate and even noble effort to persist. Individual cults which were either immoral or offensive, like that of Venus in Phœnicia, Æsculapius at Ægæ, and the Nile-priests at Heliopolis, were prohibited.[1] Private haruspices were forbidden. There is even some evidence of a general edict against sacrifices.[2] All of these things indicate the passing away of the old order and the birth of the new.

Opinion about Constantine's character takes two extreme views. On the one hand it is held that in 312 Constantine, like Paul, was miraculously converted to Christianity and that from that day forth he was a saint incarnate. Eusebius, and later panegyrists like Mosheim, are responsible for this picture. To this day the Greek churches celebrate his memory as St. "Equal of the Apostles." On the other hand it is asserted that he was nothing but a shrewd politician, able to read the signs of the times, who assumed an outward connection with Christianity solely for political expediency. Zosimus, a pagan historian, gives the worst account, ascribing to him the basest motive for every deed. Keim calls him a political trickster, and Burckhardt styles him a "murdering egoist" and "politischer Rechner" without a spark of Christianity.[3]

Was Constantine a Christian? The query is a difficult one to answer because ten men would each give a different definition of the essentials of a Christian. The favourable evidence will be considered first. Constantine's activity in behalf of the new religion, already mentioned, shows at least his sympathy for it

[1] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., ch. 55, 56, 58; iv., ch. 25, 37, 38.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii., ch. 44, 45; iii., ch. 56, 58; iv., ch. 25.

[3] For further opinions of like character read Brieger, Flasch, Baur, etc.

and no doubt his belief in it. His imperial laws, improving woman's condition, mitigating slavery, abolishing crucifixion as a method of punishment, and caring for the unfortunate, breathe forth the spirit of Christian justice and humanity.[1] He tried to convert his subjects to Christianity through Christian governors in the provinces, by letters and sermons, by rewarding towns for converting temples into churches, and by conforming to Christian worship. He diligently attended divine services, had a stated hour and place for prayer, fasted, kept Easter vigils with great devotion, and even invited his subjects to hear him preach on the folly of paganism and about the truth of Christianity. He exerted every effort to make Constantinople a Christian city—churches replaced altars, the imperial palace was adorned with biblical scenes,[2] gladiatorial combats were prohibited, and the smoke of public sacrifice never rose from the hills of New Rome.[3] The imperial treasury was lavishly used to support Christianity.[4] Constantine's sons were given a Christian education. He believed in the efficacy of baptism, even though he did postpone it to the end of his life—a common practice to wash away all sins. Besides he wished to be baptised in the river Jordan where Jesus himself was baptised. In 337 he was received into the Church as a catechumen, promised to live worthily as a follower of Jesus, was baptised, and wore the white baptismal robe till he died.[5]

[1] Sozom., i., 8; Cod. Theod. and Cod. Justin are full of these instances.

[2] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., ch. 3, 49; iv., ch. 15.

[3] *Ibid.*, ii., ch. 44, 45; iii., ch. 48; iv., ch. 24.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii., ch. 45; iii., 33–39, 41, 42, 43, 48, 58; iv., 28, 58–60.

[5] Brooks, *Date of the Death of Constantine;* Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iv., 62–64.

The unfavourable evidence submitted leads to the conclusion, held by some historians, that Constantine's conversion was not genuine, but due to hypocrisy, superstition, or policy. He retained the title Pontifex Maximus, head of the old religion. The Edict of Milan protected paganism and he continued that policy. After defeating Maxentius at Milvian Bridge he had his triumphal arch erected. The original inscription said that he triumphed over his rival by the favour of Jupiter. But these words were later erased and the neutral phrase "instinctu Divinitas" substituted.[1] In Rome he restored pagan temples and said: "You who consider it profitable to yourselves, continue to visit the public altars and temples and to observe your sacred rites."[2] Even in Constantinople temples were erected to the gods. The laws of 319 show that sacrifice still existed—at least in private houses.[3] Pagan emblems were continued on imperial coins till 330. Constantine, as Pontifex Maximus, continued to attend the sacred games connected with the pagan religion,[4] and even used pagan rites along with Christian to dedicate his new capital.[5] In 321 he ordered that when lightning should strike the imperial palace, or any public building, the soothsayers should be consulted to determine the cause as of old. The same year he employed heathen magic to heal diseases, to protect crops, to prevent rain and hail, etc.[6] He retained many pagans at court and in public office, and was very

[1] Dyer, *City of Rome*, 312.
[2] Cod. Theod., xii., i., 21; v., 2; Neander, ii., 20.
[3] *Ibid.*, 19.
[4] Cod. Theod., ix., 16, 1, 2; Zos., ii., ch. 29.
[5] Zos., ii., ch. 31; Moeller, i., 299.
[6] Neander, ii., 20, 21.

intimate with pagan philosophers like Sopater.[1] In no document did he formally renounce paganism and declare himself a Christian. He was guilty of weakness and crimes inconsistent with a Christian life. He was vain, suspicious, despotic, and gained his ambitious ends through bloody wars. He was undoubtedly guilty of murdering Licinius, his brother-in-law, contrary to a sacred pledge; Licinius, the younger, his nephew, a boy of eleven; Crispus, his eldest son, on the ground of treasonable conspiracy; and Fausta, his wife, for adultery.[2] To wipe away these sins, and many others, he accepted at the close of his life the Christian rite of baptism. After his death the Senate voted to place him among the gods.[3]

After weighing all evidence, these historical conclusions may be drawn:

1. Constantine was primarily a statesman, and wisely used both paganism and Christianity to unite his Empire and to build up his autocratic power. He was Pontifex Maximus, not alone of paganism, but of all religions.[4] The grateful Christians heartily granted that leadership. Up to 323 he kept the two religions equally balanced, but to do so he was forced to favour Christianity most. After 323 he depressed paganism and exalted Christianity. Toward the end of his life he showed a tendency to forcibly suppress the old religion.

2. Constantine was a Christian, but not as a result of a miracle at Milvian Bridge. His conversion was a gradual result of many influences. Training at his

[1] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, ii., ch. 44.
[2] This last charge is now discredited by some authorities.
[3] Eutropius, *Breviarum*, x., 4.
[4] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iv., ch. 24.

Christian mother's knee, paternal instruction, his youthful observations at the Eastern imperial court, a growing belief in monotheism, his discontent with the faith of his fathers and a proneness toward sun-worship, and his religious philosophy, which led him to look at Christianity as a system of thought rather than a life creed—a law, not a faith—a world-force of purity and simplicity—all these factors produced within him a growing comprehension of the truth, power, and beauty of Christianity. The cross in the sky and the consequent victories led to a conviction that God had selected him as the champion of the new creed, "the bishop of bishops." Contact with the leading Christians in the Empire, men of heart and brains, greatly increased his admiration for Christianity and interest in it. Just when he became a Christian no one can say, but that he died a sincere believer one can hardly doubt.[1]

3. He was a product of his age. He was actuated by both religious and political motives and was not merely an artful politician. It was not an easy thing to be a Roman Emperor and at the same time a Christian. He was guilty of grave crimes, but they were the result of gusts of passion, like those of Peter the Great, and not of constitutional depravity. Nor do these sins appear so enormous when considered in the light of his long, useful career, the dynastic difficulties confronting him, and the morality of many Christian leaders of the day. It must not be forgotten that he was a converted heathen, that the Christian code had not yet become the moral code, and that the integrity of the Empire stood above family ties and even religious demands.

[1] Cutts, *Const. the Great*, 419.

4. He made his age the beginning of a new era. He enabled Christianity to become the moulding spirit of Western civilisation. He was the first representative of that theoretical Christian theocracy which makes the Church and state two sides of God's government on earth. The Church and state were to remain united throughout all the succeeding ages to the present time. Even Protestant nations adopted the principle. Among the most noteworthy exceptions to-day are the United States, Italy, and, but recently, France. He founded the Byzantine Empire and bears the same relation to the East that Charles the Great does to the West. He gave the Church its first unity in organisation, its first universal council, and its first written creed. He stamped his own character on his age and made it greater and happier. He has continued to live through succeeding centuries by reason of what he was and what he did. For all these reasons, judged by achievement, the world unites in calling him "the Great."[1]

5. Historically, Constantine's significance lies not in the fact that he was a Christian, personally, but that he for the first time endowed the new religion with that worldly power which made it for over one thousand years the most powerful moral, social, and political agency the world has seen. Constantine the Great was succeeded by Charles the Great, and he in turn by Otto the Great. On the ruins of the Christianised Roman Empire arose the Roman Empire of the Germans, and in this the work of Constantine was really completed. Not until the Reformation and the Modern Age did the cry arise that the work of Constantine must be undone.

[1] See Cutts, *Const. the Great*, 128.

Constantine's three sons and successors continued his policy. Laws were passed favourable to Christianity. Paganism was still tolerated, but the tendency to suppress it had developed into a fixed policy. Sacrifices were forbidden on pain of death and confiscation in 352.[1] The persecuted, in turn, became the persecutors. "Emperors!" one of the Christian leaders advised, "the temples must be overthrown and utterly destroyed in order that the pernicious error may no longer pollute the Roman world. The Supreme God has committed the Government to you, so that you may cure this cancer." Pagan temples were converted into Christian churches. Unity of worship and unity of imperial rule were declared to be essential. Pagan opposition to religious unity under the Emperor was now interpreted as treason just as Christianity was so regarded before 311. Thus identified with the Empire, Christianity became the popular dominant faith. Rome and Alexandria alone clung to the old gods.[2]

Under Julian (361–363), a nephew of Constantine the Great, paganism made one last supreme effort for mastery. The reaction was inspired by Neo-Platonism, by the personal devotion of Julian to the classical faith, and by the hope of securing a stronger imperial unity through the supremacy of paganism. Julian did not openly persecute Christianity, but treated it very much as Constantine did paganism. Had he lived longer, nevertheless, harsher measures might have been employed. He seemed to feel that he was swimming against the tide, however, and fell in battle

[1] Cod. Theod., xvi., 10, 4.
[2] Gieseler, i., § 75.

against the Persians (363) saying, "Thou hast conquered, Galilean."[1]

Julian's sudden death with one stroke precipitated the decline and fall of paganism. His successor, Jovian (363-364), a Christian, restored Christianity to imperial and popular favour.[2] The legal toleration of all religions continued under Valentinian I. (d. 375) and Valens (d. 378). Emperor Gratian (375–383) began the repression of paganism in the West, and Valentinian II. (383–392) continued it, while Theodosius I. (378–395) pursued the same policy in the East, and forcibly suppressed paganism.[3] The edict of 380 constituted Christianity the exclusive religion of the whole Empire. "We command all who read this law to embrace the name of Catholic Christians, deciding that all other idiots and madmen should bear the infamy attaching to their heretical opinions, and as they will first meet with the penalty of divine vengeance, so they will afterwards receive that condemnation at our hands which the Heavenly Judge has empowered us to administer."[4] The new faith had won a famous victory. Even the old Roman Senate, the last refuge of paganism, voted that the religion of Jesus was true.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

I.—CHURCH FATHERS:

1.—Eusebius, *Life of Constantine. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, i., 472. Edited by McGiffert. Best edition. *Church History. Ib.*

[1] Negri, *Julian the Apostate*, 2 vols., N. Y., 1905; King, *Julian the Emp.*, Lond., 1888; Gardner, *Julian, Philosopher and Emp.*, N. Y., 1895; Rendall, *The Emperor Julian*, Lond., 1879; Sozom., vi., 2; Theodoret, iii., 25.

[2] Sozom., vi., 3.

[3] Cod. Theod., xvi., 10, 12.

[4] Cod. Justin, i., 1, 1.

2.—Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History.* *Ib.*, ii., bk. 1, 2.
3.—Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History.* *Ib.*, ii., bk. 1, 4.
4.—Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History.* *Ib.*, iii., bk. 1, 2.
5.—Lactantius, *Death of Persecutors.* *Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, xxi., 485; xxii., 186 *ff.*
6.—Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History.* Bohn, *Eccl. Lib.*, 1851.
7.—St. Athanasius, *Works.* *Fathers of the Holy Cath. Ch.*, viii., xiii., xix. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, iv., 2d ser.
8.—St. Basil, *Letters.* *Ib.*, viii., 109.
9.—St. Augustine, *Sermons on the New Testament.* *Fathers of the Holy Cath. Ch.*, lv., ch. 12.
10.—St. Chrysostom, *Homilies.* *Ib.*, xxi., ch. 11; *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, ix., 1st ser.
11.—St. Ambrose, *Letters*, No. 21, 23. *Fathers of the Holy Cath. Ch.*, xlv.
12.—St. Cyril, *Catechetical Lectures.* *Ib.*, xiv., ch. 22; *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, vii., 2d ser.

II.—PAGAN:

1.—Zosimus, *History.* Transl. by J. Davis, Lond., 1814.
2.—Emperor Julian, *Letters.* Transl. by E. J. Chinnock. Lond., 1901. *Sovereign Sun* and *Mother of the Gods*, in King, *Julian the Emperor.* Lond., 1888.

III.—COLLECTIONS:

1.—Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* Bohn Lib., 1892, p. 319.
2.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints.* iv., No. 1, 2; vi., No. 4.
3.—Robinson, *Readings in European History*, i., 21.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Carr, A., *The Church and the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1886.
2.—Chawner, W., *The Influence of Christianity upon the Legislation of Constantine the Great.* Lond., 1874.

3.—Cutts, E. L., *Constantine the Great.* Lond., 1881.
4.—Fletcher, J., *Life of Constantine the Great.* Lond., 1852.
5.—Gwatkin, H. M., *Studies of Arianism.* Camb., 1882. *The Arian Controversy.* N. Y., 1889.
6.—Hardy, E. G., *Christianity and the Roman Government.* Lond., 1894.
7.—Newman, J. H., *The Arians of the Fourth Century.* Lond., 1855.
8.—Saunders, G., *The State of the Christian Community before and after Constantine.* Glasg., 1882.
9.—Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* Art. on Constantine.

II.—GENERAL:

Allen, ch. 1–2. Alzog, i., § 96–100. Backhouse, pt. 2, ch. 10. Baur, ii., 225–228. Blunt, i., ch. 6. Bouzique, i., ch. 3; ii., ch. 1. Bright, 60 *ff.*, 310. Butler, ch. 23–26. Cheetham, pt. ii., ch. 1. Coxe, ch. 3. Crake, ch. 12–16. Darras, i., pd. 2, ch. 1–2. Döllinger, ii., ch. 1, sec. 1. Duff, ch. 31, 37. Fisher, pd. 3, ch. 1. Foulkes, ch. 4. Gibbon, ch. 17–25. Gieseler, div. 3, pd. 2, ch. 1, sec. 75–77. Gilmartin, i., ch. 10. Guericke, sec. 61–63. Hase, sec. 93–95. Hore, ch. 5. Hurst, i., 410–426. Jackson, ch. 12–16. Jennings, i., ch. 4. Knight, ch. 6. Kurtz, i., §42–43. Mahan, bk. 2, ch. 10. Milman, bk. 1, ch. 2. Milner, i., cent. 4, ch. 2–3. Moeller, i., 296–308. Mosheim, ii., 454–481. Neander, ii., 1–32. Newman, i., 305–319. Robertson, bk. 2, ch. 1. Schaff, ii., 1–37. Stanley, 281.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA AND ITS RESULTS

OUTLINE: I.—Diversion of Christian thought in the early Church. II.—The Arian controversy. III.—The Council of Nicæa and its actions. IV.—Later history of Arianism. V.—Sources.

EARLY Christianity was characterised by a remarkable intellectual activity, which was chiefly theological and philosophical. Speculative discussions were rife, particularly in the East, where the different philosophical systems were prominent. Jesus left no definite creed, which all could understand alike.[1] The Ante-Nicene period was full of sharp and bitter theological and ecclesiastical antagonisms. Such an epoch of dissension and division the world was not to witness again until the dawn of the Protestant Revolt.

Christian converts came from Judaism, and from various types of paganism, hence at the very outset there was a tendency to create two distinct types of Christianity—the Jewish and the non-Jewish. This lack of unity and uniformity was clearly seen and sneered at by the pagan scholars.[2] This was Origen's significant explanation:

[1] Epiphanius, ch. 29, 30, 53.

[2] Notably Celsus, who declared that the Christians "were divided and split up into factions, each individual desiring to have his own party."

Seeing that Christianity appeared an object of veneration to men, and not to the labouring and serving classes alone, but also to many among the Greeks who were devoted to literary pursuits, there necessarily originated sects, not at all as a result of faction and strife, but through the earnest desire of many literary men to enter more profoundly into the truths of Christianity. The consequence was, that understanding differently those things which were considered divine by all, there arose sects, which received their names from men who admired Christianity in its fundamental nature, but from a variety of causes reached discordant views.

Among the heretical sects of the Ante-Nicene period were:

1. The Ebionites,[1] who were Judaising Christians as shown in the book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles. They desired to be both Jews and Christians, and ended by being neither. They soon divided up into many sects.[2] They lived in and about Palestine for the first three centuries of the Christian era. They believed that God made the world and gave the Mosaic law, which was still essential to salvation; that Jesus was the Messiah, though not divine, only a great man like Moses and David; but they denounced Paul and heroised James and Peter. They observed the Jewish Sabbath, retained the rite of circumcision, and observed the law. In the minds of the great body of orthodox Christians they were regarded as heretics.

2. The Gnostics[3] embraced various factions, mostly

[1] Irenæus, i., ch. 26; Hippolytus, ix., ch. 13–17; Epiphanius, ch. 29, 30, 53; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., ch. 27; Schaff, ii., 420; Neander, i., 341; Moeller, i., 97; various histories of dogma and encyclopedias.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iii., ch. 27.

[3] Irenæus, *Against Heresies;* Hippolytus, *Refutation of all Heresies;* Tertullian; Origen; Epiphanius; Gieseler, i., 129; ii., 442; Moeller, i.,

pagan converts to Christianity, which flourished in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt chiefly during the second century. Their ideas can be traced back to Philo's Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, to Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, and to the old Egyptian religion. Knowledge, above all else, was the one thing desired. Believing in the inherent evil of matter, they sought to account for a bad world without compromising God. Jehovah of the Old Testament was rejected as the Supreme Being. They cast aside all the New Testament except the Pauline Epistles and parts of the Gospels. They professed to apprehend the divine mysteries. Some advocated asceticism, and others gave the utmost license to the flesh. All believed in the idea of the evolution of the world, through Christ, to an ideal state. Although denounced as heretics, they left a marked influence on Christianity. Gnosticism was so speculative, however, that it gave rise to many leaders and creeds.

3. The Manichæans[1] accepted Gnosticism minus true Christianity and adopted Oriental dualism under Christian names. Manichæism originated with Mani about 238 in Persia and spread westward over the Christian Church. Its leading principle was absolute dualism — a kingdom of light and one of darkness in eternal opposition, yet brought together by a sort of pantheism. Christianity was accepted, but explained in terms of this dualism. The Old Testament was

129; King, *The Gnostics and their Remains;* Neander, i., 566; Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies;* Baur, i., 185; Bright, *Gnosticism and Irenæus.*

[1] Archelaus in *Ante-Nic. Lib.*; Epiphanius, 66; Augustine in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 1st ser., iv.; Pressense, *Her. and Chr. Doctrine;* Gieseler, i., 203; Schaff, ii., 498; Moeller, i., 289; Neander, i., 478; Mozley, *Manichæans;* histories of dogma and encyclopedias.

wholly rejected as well as parts of the New. The elevated priesthood celebrated the secret rites of baptism and communion with solemn pomp, lived as ascetics, possessed no property, and abstained from wine and animal food. This system, claiming to be true Christianity, had a marked influence on both the doctrines and organisation of the Church.[1]

4. The Monarchians[2] denied the doctrine of the Trinity, but were divided into a number of groups. The Alogoi in the second century rejected all of the Apostle John's works and denied the eternity of the Logos as a person of the Godhead. Theodatus, a leather dealer of Byzantium, went to Rome in 190 and taught that Jesus was a "mere man" till baptism gave him divine attributes. Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was excommunicated in 269 for advocating the doctrine that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one person, God. He maintained that Jesus was a divinely begotten man exalted to divine dignity by the Holy Spirit or Logos—an attribute of God. Praxeas of Asia Minor visited Rome about 195 and later preached in Carthage. He held that the Father and Christ were one and attributed the "Passion" to God, hence his party were called the Patripassians. Sabellianism was simply another form of this heresy and helped to precipitate the Arian controversy.

In addition to these four heretical sects there were three distinct reactionary and reforming parties:

[1] Augustine, the greatest Latin Father, was a Manichæan for many years, as some maintain.

[2] See History of Doctrine by Fisher, Shedd, Sheldon, Hagenbach, Baur, Loofs, and Harnach; Dorner, *The Person of Christ;* Conybeare, *The Key of Truth;* encyclopedias.

1. Montanism[1] originated, like so many radical movements, in Asia Minor (150?). Montanus professed to have received a message from the "Paraclete" to reform the growing worldliness and the lax ecclesiastical discipline of the Church. Montanists denounced the innovations introduced into the Church, and sought to return to the simpler and purer doctrines and organisation of the early Church. They preached a universal priesthood of all believers. In exalting virginity, widowhood, and martyrdom, in professing a contempt for the world with all its excesses, and in insisting upon an arbitrary holiness, Montanism was a force paving the way for ascetic Christianity. They accepted all the fundamental principles of the Church, but professed to receive special divine revelations from the "Paraclete," as the Holy Ghost was called. They lived in constant expectation of the coming of the end of the world. Tertullian was their greatest apologist. But both the Christian hierarchy and the imperial power were turned against these reforming puritans. Under Justinian Montanism disappeared (532).

2. The Novatianists[2] withdrew from the Church protesting against the readmission of those who through fear deserted the Church in the Decian persecution (249–251). They were strong in North Africa and Asia Minor, and continued until the sixth century,

[1] Tertullian; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, v., ch. 14–18; Epiphanius, *Heresy*, 48, 49; Sozomen, ii., 32; Pressensé, *Heresy and Chr. Doctr.*, 101; Mossman, *Hist. of Early Chr. Ch.*, 401; Neander, i., 508; Schaff, ii., 405; Moeller, i., 156; De Sayres, *Montanism;* Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christ'y with Heathenism;* Baur, i., 245; ii., 45; Ramsay, 434; encyclopedias.

[2] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., ch. 43, 45; vii., ch. 8; Cyprian, *Ep.*, 41–52; Socrates, iv., 28; Neander, i., 237; Gieseler, i., 254; Moeller, i., 263; encyclopedias.

absorbing most of the Montanists. In doctrine and organisation they did not differ from the regular Church, but only on the question of discipline. They also laid unusual stress on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Their churches were still found in the fifth century in Rome till closed by Innocent I.

3. The Donatists[1] grew out of the Montanist opposition to laxity and innovation in the Church and Novatian strictness of discipline. The Donatists denounced the Christians who during the Diocletian persecution delivered up the Scriptures, and tried to drive them out of the Church. The party centred in Carthage and was led by Bishop Donatus. They believed in ecclesiastical purism, held the Church to be an exclusive society of saved sinners, emphasised inner holiness as a qualification of membership, asserted the necessity of baptismal regeneration and infant baptism, said unholy priests could not administer the sacraments, advocated rigid discipline, resisted the union of Church and state, and were organised as a hierarchy. They were very active in the early part of the fourth century, and attempted to secure the support of Constantine. He decided against them and tried to quiet them. Emperor Julian favoured them, but Augustine sought their overthrow. Finally the Vandals swept them away.

The Arian controversy was a natural product of the early differences about the nature of the Godhead and was distinctly connected with the Ebionites, Gnostics, Montanists, and Sabellians. In the Eastern speculation about the mystery of the Holy Trinity, one faction

[1] Augustine in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, iv.; Hefele, i.–ii.; Neander, ii., 214; Schaff, iii., 360; various works on history of doctrine; encyclopedias.

of theorists tended to "refine the Deity into a mental conception"; another to "impersonate Him into a material being." Between these extremes arose the discussion about "the nature and relation between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." [1] Tertullian and Origen both attempted to solve the problem. Dionysius of Alexandria (260), in a contest with the Sabellians, is reported to have declared: "The Son of God is a work and a creature, not appertaining to Him by nature, but as regards His essence, as foreign to the Father as the husbandman to the vine . . . For as a creature, he did not exist before he was produced." [2] Dionysius of Rome, backed up by a synod, repudiated that proposition and clearly stated the orthodox Trinitarian view. Origen widened the breach by asserting the eternal divinity of Christ, but at the same time maintaining also His subordination to the Father as a "secondary God." The conflicting schools of theology at Alexandria and Antioch were ready to take sides in the controversy, which reached a crisis at the end of the third century, when all theological thought was focused on this one question.

The controversy broke out in Alexandria in 318.[3] Bishop Alexander in a public address insisted on the interpretation of the eternity of the Son. Arius, a presbyter, charged the bishop with Sabellianism, which advocated an undivided Godhead, and held that Christ

[1] Milman, *Hist. of Christ.*, i., 65

[2] The Bishop of Rome held a synod in which these ideas were denounced and the orthodox view upheld.

[3] For the controversy see the histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius; Epiphanius, *Heresy*, 69; Athanasius; Hilary; Basil; Ambrose; Augustine; the two Gregories and Rufinus; Newman, *Arians in the Fourth Cent.*; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism.*

was a creature of God, hence not coexistent and eternal.[1] He and his followers held that God alone was eternal; that He created the Son, or Logos, by His *fiat*, hence the Son is different in essence and finite; that the Son was created before time was and in turn made the universe and rules it; that the Son is Logus in soul, stands between God and man, and is to be worshipped as the most exalted of creatures, the creator and ruler of the world, and the Redeemer of men. It was contended that all these propositions could be proved beyond dispute from the Bible.[2]

Alexander, in a personal interview, sought to stop Arius,[3] who was an old priest in control of the most influential church in the city,—a proud, learned, ambitious, and fascinating man,[4] who, defeated in his candidacy for the arch-episcopacy of Alexandria,[5] began to foment social and religious circles by attacking Alexander. Failing to quiet him, Alexander called a synod to discuss the disputed points, but Arius seemed to carry the day and continued his agitation. Then the bishop commanded Arius and his followers to renounce their "impiety."[6] Refusing to obey, Arius was called before a local council in 320 and there excommunicated.[7] But Arius now spread his views all the more zealously by conversation, by letters, by sermons, and later, while an exile, in a poetic work called *The Banquet*. His doctrines pleased the wide-

[1] Socrates, i., ch. 5.

[2] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, pt. ii., ch. 7.

[3] Socrates, i., 6. See Neander, ii. 403; Schaff, ii., 616; Gibbon, ch. 21; Stanley, *Lect.*, 2–3; Moeller, i., 382; Kurtz, i., 317.

[4] Socrates, i., 5; ii., 35.

[5] Theodoret, i., 4; *cf.* Philostorgius, i., 3.

[6] See two letters in Socrates, i., 6.

[7] *Ibid.*

spread rationalism, and hence became very popular. They were put into popular songs and sung everywhere, and became the chief topic of conversation in all social circles. Arius, however, was forced to flee[1] to Palestine and thence to Nicomedia, while Alexander drew up his encyclic to all Christian Bishops (323)[2] giving the history of the controversy and defending the Trinitarian position.

The eastern part of the Empire broke up into two powerful parties: the Arians and the Trinitarians or Athanasians. "In every city bishops were engaged in obstinate conflict with bishops and people rising against people."[3] Theology became mere technology. Staunch partisans came forth as champions on both sides—Eusebius, the Church historian, Eusebius, the Bishop of Nicomedia, Chrysostom, Theodore, and Ephraëm stood for Arianism; while Athanasius, Marcellus, Basil, Cyril, and Blind Didymus became Alexander's supporters. In a short time the whole Eastern Church became a "metaphysical battle-field." Finally both sides appealed to Constantine, who, viewing the contest as a war of words, wrote a common letter and sent it by his court-bishop to both leaders in which he said that the quarrel was childish and unworthy such churchmen; that moreover it was displeasing to him personally, hence they were asked to stop it.[4] When this imperial request failed, Constantine summoned the Council of Nicæa to settle the dispute.[5]

The Council of Nicæa was summoned by the Emperor

[1] Theodoret, i., 5.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., ch. 4.
[4] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, ii., ch. 64–72; Socrates, i., 7.
[5] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 6.

for the summer of 325. Constantine's purpose in convening it was to settle by compromise or otherwise religious disputes which might easily become a political danger to the Empire. It was the first universal council of Christendom. Of the two thousand persons in attendance more than three hundred were bishops.[1] All of the thirteen provinces in the Empire except Britain were represented.[2] All the West, however, sent but six representatives—good proof that the Arian controversy was an Eastern question. The Bishop of Rome was too old to go so he sent two presbyters to represent him.[3] Even a few pagan philosophers were attracted to the Council, and actually took part in the discussions.[4]

In organising the Council the bishops were seated according to rank.[5] Discussions occurred for some time before Constantine arrived. Then the Emperor entered "as a messenger from God, covered with gold and precious stones, a magnificent figure, tall and slender, and full of grace and majesty." He opened the Council with these words: "When I was told of the division amongst you, I was convinced that I ought not to attend to any business before this; and it is from the desire of being useful to you that I have convened you without delay; but I shall not believe my end to be attained until I have united the minds of all, until I see that peace and that union reign amongst you which you are commissioned as the anointed of the

[1] Historians disagree about the number; Eusebius gives 250; Theodoret, 300; Milman, 323; Döllinger, 318; Gwatkin, 223; etc.

[2] Gwatkin, 21.

[3] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 7; Socrates, i., 14; Sozomen, i., 17; Milman, i., 99.

[4] Socrates, i., 8; Sozomen, i., 17, 18.

[5] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., ch. 10.

Lord to preach to others."[1] He took part in the deliberations also and acted as the real head of the Council, though the Spanish Bishop Hosius probably served as the spiritual president.[2] Only bishops or their accredited proxies had a vote.

Three distinct parties immediately appeared in the Council: (1) The Arians led by Arius. Twenty bishops with Eusebius of Nicomedia at their head constituted the voting party. (2) The Semi-Arians were led by Eusebius of Cæsarea, the Church historian. They had a majority and were inclined partly to the Arians and partly to the orthodox side. (3) The Trinitarians, or orthodox party, led by Alexander, Hosius, Macarius, Marcellus, and Athanasius. At the outset they were in the minority, but soon came to control the Council.

Unfortunately the authentic minutes of the transactions are not now extant,[3] if indeed they ever existed. The Arians, it appears, came to the Council confident of victory because the Emperor's sister Constantia was an avowed Arian, and he himself was supposed to be a sympathiser, since so many scholars about him upheld the doctrine. But when Arius presented his creed signed by eighteen eminent names, it created an uproar, the creed was seized and torn to pieces, and its doctrines repudiated. All the signers but Arius and two bishops then abandoned the project. Eusebius of Cæsarea came forward at this juncture with an old

[1] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 12; Theodoret, i., 7; Hefele, *Hist. of the Ch. Councils*, 280, 281.

[2] Hefele, i., 281; Moeller, i., 336, suggests Eustachius of Antioch and Alexander of Alexandria.

[3] No minutes in the modern sense were kept. After measures were agreed upon they were signed and thus promulgated. See Hefele, i., 262.

Palestine creed as a compromise.[1] It acknowledged the divine nature of Jesus. The Emperor favoured it, and the Arians were willing to accept it, but Athanasius was suspicious and demanded so many changes that when, after two months of solemn discussion, the amended creed was passed,[2] Eusebius, the originator, hesitated to sign it. This was a grand triumph for the orthodox party. The Emperor required all bishops to subscribe to it.[3] The Semi-Arians did so under protest. Arius and two Egyptian bishops[4] refused and were banished to Illyria.[5] Arius was publicly excommunicated and his writings ordered burned. The business of the Council concluded, Constantine dismissed it with a splendid feast which Eusebius likened to the kingdom of Heaven.[6]

The results of Nicæa were very significant:

1. The Church was given its first written creed, the Nicene Creed—the basis of all later creeds, Greek, Latin, and Evangelical.[7] This was the first official definition of the Trinity and has continued to be the orthodox interpretation. The Nicene Creed contains all the cardinal Christian doctrines. It was universally proclaimed as imperial law.

2. Church canons were enacted—the West accepts twenty, the East more—which constitute the basis for

[1] Theodoret, i., 12; *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xiv., 1.

[2] The Nicene Creed of the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Anglican churches is not this one but "the baptismal creed of the Church of Jerusalem" enlarged in 362–373.

[3] The Latin list of names numbers 228, though the original Greek lists certainly had more. Hefele, i., 296.

[4] Sozomen, i., 9, 21; Theodoret, i., 7, 8.

[5] Sozomen, i., 21; Socrates, i., 9.

[6] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 15.

[7] Univ. of Pa., *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 2; Schaff, iii., 631; Fulton, *Index Canonum.*

the canon law of the Middle Ages.[1] These canons indicate the burning questions in the Church at that time.

3. The method of calculating the date for Easter, which differed in Eastern churches and Western churches, was determined.[2]

4. This Council, guided, as was believed, by the Holy Ghost, acted as the infallible, sovereign power of the Church and set precedents which later conflicted with the supreme power claimed by the Pope.

5. The development of the papal hierarchy was stimulated. The Bishop of Rome was recognised as the only Patriarch in the West.[3] He was soon forced to be the recognised champion of orthodoxy.

6. The Council of Nicæa marks the beginning of the breach between the East and the West which resulted in the first great schism in Christendom.

7. The law of celibacy was almost imposed on the Church.[4]

8. Interference in the most vital concerns of the Church was recognised as an imperial prerogative. The Emperor called the Council, presided over its proceedings, acted as mediator between contending factions, forced the Nicene Creed on the Church, fixed the day for celebrating Easter, and approved the first ecclesiastical canons.

9. The various heresies and schisms of the time were condemned. This action threw into prominent relief throughout the Empire the powerful party of

[1] Univ. of Pa., *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 2. Cf. *Hefele*, i., 355 ff.

[2] Excellent discussion of the whole question in Hefele, i., sec. 37.

[3] About 350 the canons were interpolated so as to give the Bishop of Rome a primacy.

[4] Socrates, i., ch. 11; Sozomen, i., 23; Schaff, ii., 411; Hefele, i., 435.

orthodox Catholics, who henceforth were to control the destinies of the Church in both its internal and external organisation and evolution.

The condemnation of Arianism was only a temporary victory. Soon Constantine himself was won over by the Arians, invited Arius to his court, and ordered Athanasius, who meanwhile had become Bishop of Alexandria (328), to reinstate Arius in his parish. Athanasius refused to do so, and was condemned and deposed by the councils of Tyre (334) and of Constantinople (335), and exiled by the Emperor to Treves in Gaul. Arius died before he could be recalled (336). Constantine II. restored Athanasius to his see (338), but his brother Constantius and his Arian friends deposed him again (339). Athanasius then fled to Pope Julius at Rome (339), who laid his case before a Western council (341) which vindicated both his creed and his rights. This supreme appellate power assumed by the Bishop of Rome is significantly prophetic.

To heal the Arian conflict, which was again active —this time between the East and the West,—the Council of Sardica was called in 343. The Roman party controlled it, reconfirmed the Nicene Creed, and adopted twelve new canons. The Arians refused to take part and held a rump council. The result was a wider separation of the East and the West.[1] Under Constantius, however, the Arian party grew stronger, held the three Arian councils of Sirmium (351), Arles (353), and Milan (355), forced their decrees upon the whole Church, exiled Hosius, Hilary, and Lucifer, drove Athanasius, who had meanwhile once more

[1] Hefele, ii.

returned to his office (346), out of his see, and even deposed Pope Liberius[1] and elected an Arian Pope, Felix II., in his place. Thus the Arian party seemed triumphant East and West.

But the Arians soon split into bitter factions and began to destroy themselves. Under Emperor Julian they lost imperial favour and saw the Nicene party tolerated. The orthodox faction was thus able to gradually re-win power in the West and South. Theodosius the Great (379–395) externally completed the Nicene conquest of the whole Empire through an imperial edict (380) and by calling the second general Council of Constantinople (381), which ratified the Nicene Creed in a revised form and passed seven additional canons.[2] But Arianism lingered long within the Empire, especially among the Teutons, who were slow to accept the Roman faith—the Vandals in 530, the Burgundians in 534, the Suevi in 560, the Goths in 587, and the Longobards in 600.[3] It also reappeared again and again in the later heresies on down to the present day.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—CHURCH FATHERS:

1.—Eusebius, *Life of Constantine. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers.* 2d ser., i., bk. 2, 3. *Church History. Ib.*, i.

2.—Athanasius, *Works.* 2d ser., *ib.*, iv. *Fath. of the Holy Cath. Ch.*, viii., xiii., xix. Bright, W., *Orations.* Oxf., 1873.

[1] Pope Liberius was reinstated, after the death of Felix II., on subscribing to the Arian articles.

[2] Univ. of Pa., *Transl. and Rep.*, iv., No. 2, p. 11; *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xiv., 163.

[3] See Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders.*

3.—Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers.* 2d ser., ii., bk. 1, ch. 8 *ff.*
4.—Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History.* 2d ser., *ib.*, ii., bk. 1, ch. 17 *ff.*
5.—Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History.* 2d ser., *ib.*, iii., bk. 1, ch. 1–13.
6.—Philostorgius, *Eptiome of Ecclesiastical History.* Bohn, *Eccl. Lib.*, ii., 429–528.

II.—COLLECTIONS:

1.—Percival, H. R., *The Seven Ecumenical Councils.* In *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xiv. N. Y., 1900.
2.—Pusey, E., *The Councils of the Church* (to 381).
3.—Fulton, J., *Index Canonum.* N. Y., 1892.
4.—Lambert, W., *Canons of the First Four General Councils.* Lond., 1868.
5.—Hammond, W. A., *The Six Œcumenical Councils.* Oxf., 1843.
6.—Bright, W., *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils.* N. Y., 1892.
7.—Mitchell, E. K., *Canons of the First Four General Councils.* Univ. of Pa., *Transl. and Repr.*, iv.
8.—Chrystal, J., *Authoritative Christianity.* Jersey City, 1891. Vol. i.
9.—Schaff, P., *The Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches.* Lond., 1877, ii., 28, 29, 57–62, 66.
10.—Lumby, J. R., *The History of the Creeds.* Lond., 1880. Vol. ii.
11.—Howard, G. B., *Canons of the Primitive Church.* Lond., 1896.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL

1.—Boyle, I., *Historical View of the Council of Nicæa.* N. Y., 1856.
2.—Bright, W., *Waymarks of Church History.* Lond., 1894, 56 *ff.*
3.—Bull, G., *Defence of the Nicene Faith.* 1685. Transl. in *Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.* Lond., 1851.
4.—Dorner, I. A., *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.* Edinb., 1861–3. 5 vols.

5.—DuBose, W. P., *The Ecumenical Councils.* N. Y., 1897.
6.—Dudley, T. W., *History of the First Council of Nicæa.* Bost., 1880.
7.—Gwatkin, H. M., *Studies in Arianism.* Camb., 1882. *The Arian Controversy.* N. Y., 1889. ch. 1, 2.
8.—Hefele, C. J., *History of the Church Councils.* Edinb., 1882–3. Bk. ii., ch. 1, 2.
9.—Kaye, J., *Some Account of the Council of Nicæa.* Lond., 1883.
10.—Neal, J. M., *History of the Holy Eastern Church.* Lond., 1850–73.
11.—Newman, J. H., *The Arians of the Fourth Century.* N. Y., 1888.
12.—Stanley, A. P., *History of the Eastern Church.* N. Y., 1875.
13.—Swainson, C. A., *The Nicene and Apostolic Creeds.* Lond., 1875.

Note.—See Chap. VII. for additional works.

II.—GENERAL:

Adeney, ch. 1. Allies, v., ch. 37–39. Alzog, i., § 110–112. Backhouse, pt. 11, ch. 11, 12. Bartlet, ch. 9. Baur, ii., 112–120. Bouzique, ii., ch. 1. Butler, ch. 24. Cheetham, pt. 2, ch. 10, 11. Coxe, ch. 2, sec. 15; ch. 3, sec. 10–14. Crooks, ch. 21–23. Darras, i., pd. 2, ch. 1. Döllinger, i., ch. 2; ii., ch. 3, 4; iii., ch. 2, sec. 2, 3. Duff, ch. 33, 34, 35. Fisher, 104, 119, 130. Fleury, bk. 21. Foulkes, ch. 4. Gibbon, ch. 21. Gieseler, i., sec. 81–84. Gilmartin, i., 16. Guericke, sec. 81–93. Harnack, *Dogma*, iv., ch. 1. Hase, sec. 102–104. Hore, ch. 4. Hurst, i., 431 *ff.* Jackson, ch. 11–16. Jennings, i., ch. 4. Kurtz, i., § 49. Mahan, bk. iv., ch. 1–6. Milman, i., bk. 1, ch. 2. Milner, i., cent. 4, ch. 3, 4. Moeller, i., 331–337. Neander, ii., 403 *ff.* Newman, i., pd. 3, ch. 2, p. 323. Robertson, bk. 2, ch. 1. Schaff, iii., 616–689. Stoughton, pt. 2, ch. 1.

CHAPTER IX

RISE OF THE PAPACY

OUTLINE: I.—Favourable conditions when the Christian era began. II.—Forces at work up to 313. III.—Description of the Roman Church in 313. IV.—Growth of the Papacy from 313 to 604. V.—Condition of the Papacy at the close of this period, 604. VI.—Sources.

TO see how a handful of outlawed, persecuted Christians in Rome became the omnipotent hierarchy of the Middle Ages is to comprehend the most marvellous fact in European history. But when the conditions and forces, which produced this wonderful organisation, are clearly understood, the miracle becomes a natural and an inevitable product.

In the first century of the Christian era Rome was the heart and mistress of the world.[1] The Apostle Paul gloried in having introduced Christianity into the great metropolis.[2] The Roman Empire had developed an imperial and provincial system of government which was to serve as the model for the organisation of the Christian Church. This decaying Empire, after a futile contest with Christianity, was to become its servant. The mighty Catholic Church was little more than the Roman Empire baptised. Rome was transformed as well as converted. The very capital of the old Empire became the capital of the Christian

[1] Acts xix., 21; xxiii., 11; xxv., 11; xxviii., 14 *ff.*

[2] Rom. i., 8.

Empire. The office of Pontifex Maximus was continued in that of Pope. The deeply religious character of the Romans on the one hand, and the inadequate and degenerate religion which they held on the other, were positive and negative forces enabling the Christian Church to make rapid conquests in territory and numbers. Even the Roman language has remained the official language of the Roman Catholic Church down through the ages. Christianity could not grow up through Roman civilisation and paganism, however, without in turn being coloured and influenced by the rites, festivities, and ceremonies of old polytheism. Christianity not only conquered Rome, but Rome conquered Christianity. It is not a matter of great surprise, therefore, to find that from the first to the fourth century the Church had undergone many changes. During the first half of the third century the hierarchical scheme of Church government appeared to reach a very advanced stage of organisation. Cyprian gives us the boldest and broadest claim of the Bishop of Rome to the heirship of Peter. By the fourth century the hierarchical and monarchial principles were fully developed, and the Papacy had begun its wonderful career.

The leading forces operating to develop the Roman hierarchy up to 313 will now be indicated.

1. The fundamental factor which first attracts attention in the consideration of this problem is the obvious advantage in location. In the origin of the civilisation of Western Europe three cities have been conspicuous for their contributions—Jerusalem, Athens, and Rome. Jerusalem, the sacred city, gave Christianity to the West and through the West to the world. Athens, the city of culture, bequeathed philosophy,

art, ideals, and science to the Romans, and through them to the Celts, Teutons, and all peoples. Rome, the city of power, overthrew Jerusalem, took Athens captive, received the contributions of both as her right, and on the ruins of both built up her universal sovereignty. The rise of Rome to world dominion is one of the deepest mysteries in history. Rome possessed the matchless capacity of appropriating everything on earth that would contribute to her greatness. When Jesus appeared to give the world Christianity, Rome was the centre of all power and influence.

Rome was in the highest degree adapted to spread civilisation abroad. From Rome influences could be sent out into the world which could not possibly have emanated from Jerusalem or Athens. In fact anything connected with Rome assumed, in consequence, an importance by virtue of Rome's greatness that no other part of the world could give. Christianity in its cosmopolitan character resembled Rome and was drawn thither irresistibly as the best centre for propagandism. Hence, from the outset, the Roman Christian Church was a church of world-wide importance and power, and her bishop the most influential. Out of the ruins of political Rome, arose the great moral Empire in the "giant form" of the Roman Church. In the marvellous rise of the Roman Church is seen in strong relief the majestic office of the Bishop of Rome.[1]

2. In addition to the favourable location and extraordinary opportunity that site gave, the fact that the Church, planted in Rome and there organised by

[1] Gregorovius, i., 5.

Peter and Paul, was thus established on a double apostolic foundation gave to the Bishop of Rome a respected and commanding position from the very outset.[1] No other church west of the Adriatic could claim such a distinguished origin. It was both easy and logical, therefore, to make the Bishop of Rome not only a commanding leader in the universal Church, but more particularly the conspicuous head of the Church of the West.[2]

3. The theory about Peter's primacy,[3] asserted certainly as early as the second century and generally accepted in the third century, gave an indelible character to both the person and office of the Bishop of Rome, and elevated him high above all other officers in the Church. The actual *belief* in this theory, a fact which cannot be questioned, made possible the realisation of the papal hierarchy. It seems to be an actual fact, likewise, that before the end of the second century the pontiffs of Rome had assumed a title implying a jurisdiction over the whole Christian world as successors and representatives of Peter, the Prince of Apostles. Irenæus said: "Because, therefore, of her apostolic foundation, and the regular succession of bishops, through whom she hath handed down that which she received from them [the Apostles], all churches, that is, all the faithful around her and on all sides, must on account of her more powerful pre-eminence resort to this church, in which the tradition, which is from the Apostles, is preserved."[4] Tertullian, after he

[1] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 104, 107.

[2] The East had four Patriarchs: Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople.

[3] See Chap. VI.

[4] *Against Heresies*, iii., c. 3.

had joined the heretical Montanists, accused the Bishop of Rome of assuming the titles of "Pontifex Maximus" and "Bishop of Bishops."[1] He complains also that the "Supreme Pontiff" was in the habit of quoting the decisions of his predecessors as conclusive on all disputed questions, and that he furthermore claimed that he himself sat in the chair of St. Peter. These charges show how early the Petrine claims were made and recognised.[2]

4. The missionary zeal of the Roman Church soon led to the formation of a number of suburban branches and within a comparatively short period to the spread of Christianity throughout Italy and to other sections of Western Europe.[3] These local churches naturally looked to the head of the Church in the great capital for assistance and instruction, and were willing to acknowledge his jurisdiction and pretensions. The episcopal organisation of the Church in the West, which was probably present from the beginning,[4] made the transition to the hierarchy comparatively simple. At Rome the process may be more plainly traced than in connection with any other church.

5. The persecutions of the Christians[5] centred in Rome and, consequently, made the Bishop of Rome a conspicuous leader, with social and political, as well as religious duties, whose office was frequently sanctified by martyrdom. The persecutions helped to emphasise the necessity of a better organisation on a monarchio-episcopal basis. That organisation be-

[1] *On Modesty*, §1.
[2] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 107–108.
[3] Gibbon, i., 579 *ff.* See Chap. V.
[4] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 175.
[5] See Chap. VII.

came very exclusive,[1] and made a responsible head imperative. Who else but the Bishop of Rome could meet the demands? To him was given, by general consent in the West, the headship of the Church and he began to act as the conscious Pope of Christendom.

6. The Bishop of Rome was the only official organ of communication between the East and West. He was the sole Patriarch of all the united West, while the East had four Patriarchs,[2] and the sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa confirmed his jurisdiction as an "ancient custom." From Clement (95), whose writings are the earliest of any Bishop of Rome preserved, onward, he speaks in an authoritative tone, not only to the churches of Carthage, Italy, and Gaul, but also to Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Alexandria. Notwithstanding the fact that Alexandria and Antioch also claimed Peter for their founder, yet not one of the four patriarchates attempted to contest Rome's claim to priority of rank.[3]

7. The head of the Roman Church was the champion of orthodoxy and kept the Western Church free from schism. The Church of Rome stood consistently for purity in doctrine and steadfastly opposed that Oriental mysticism which polluted the Eastern churches with a host of heretic and theosophic jugglers. Epiphanius gives a list of forty-three distinct heresies in his day. It

[1] Origen said: "*Extra hanc domum*, i.e., *extra ecclesiam nemo salvator.*" *Hom.* 3.

St. Cyprian of Carthage asked: "Do they that are met outside of the Church of Christ think that Christ is with them when they meet? . . . It is not possible for one to be a martyr who is not in the church." *Unity of the Church*, ch. 13, 14.

[2] Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, and, later, Constantinople. The four early patriarchates were of apostolic foundation.

[3] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 193.

was no easy matter for the Church of Rome to faithfully combat all these theological vagaries and point out the straight but narrow way. As a reward of her fight for the simple gospel-truth the provincial churches bestowed upon her their affection, confidence, and obedience. They frequently referred for their own guidance to her spiritual experience, in deference and respect they sought her counsels, they watched her course with anxiety and faithfully imitated it, and all these things gave her a singular spiritual influence and authority in this early period, which was not unlike the political power exercised by the city of Rome. Again and again the Bishop of Rome was requested to pass judgment on the various heresies.

8. After the apostolic days, the multitudes who embraced Christianity seemed in many instances to lack the original fervour and spirituality. Hence to control the erring, to correct the heretical, to expel those who brought disgrace to the society, and to protect the faithful, it became necessary to develop some more efficient form of government.[1] The Roman model of imperial and local government naturally suggested itself and was either consciously or unconsciously imitated. The gradual transformation of the Bishop of Rome into the Pope of Rome was the product.

9. In the apostolic days the practice generally prevailed of referring all civil, as well as ecclesiastical, disputes between Christians to the arbitrament of their superior ecclesiastical officials. St. Paul even went so far as to forbid his converts to resort to the pagan tribunals.[2] This work devolved upon the bishop, as a matter of course, who acted, however, rather with

[1] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 164, 165.

[2] 1 Cor. vi., 1, 13.

paternal authority and through moral influence, than in accordance with fixed Church law. Thus special duties were laid upon the Bishop of Rome because of his superior rank and extended jurisdiction.

So rapidly did his prerogatives develop that he was early recognised both East and West as, practically, a court of appeal. About 95 A.D., Clement of Rome wrote letters of remonstrance and admonition to settle a wrangle in the church at Corinth, and so respected were these epistles that for a century they were publicly read in the churches. About the year 150 one Marcian was excommunicated by his bishop and appealed to Rome for admission to communion. The petition was refused but it shows the influence of the Bishop of Rome. Polycarp of Smyrna showed at least a dutiful deference in going to Rome to lay before Bishop Anicetus (152) the disputed paschal question. When the East and the West were divided, about 190 A.D., upon the proper day for celebrating Easter, Bishop Victor of Rome assumed the authority to decide on the correct day and insisted that all Christendom conform to his decision. The Eastern churches refused to obey him, it is true, but the Council of Nicæa enforced universal conformity to the day chosen by Victor.[1] When Fortunatus and Cyprian of Carthage quarrelled over the former's claim to the title of bishop, Fortunatus appealed to the Bishop of Rome, Cornelius, for official recognition. Cornelius assumed the right to remonstrate with Cyprian and to demand an explanation of his conduct. Cyprian repudiated foreign jurisdiction in the domestic affairs of the African Church, but at the same time recognised Rome as "the

[1] See Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*, for a full discussion of the paschal controversy.

chair of Peter—that principal Church whence the sacerdotal unity takes its rise."[1] In 252, two Spanish bishops, Basileides and Martialis, were deposed for misconduct by a synod of their province. They appealed to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, who peremptorily ordered that both be reinstated.[2] The bishops of Gaul applied to Stephen for advice as to what to do with Marcian, the Bishop of Arles, who had embraced Novatianism.[3] In the West, it seems, therefore, that practically all disputes and misunderstandings were referred to the recognised head of the Church for advice and settlement. Again and again the Eastern Patriarchs appealed to the Patriarch of the West for support and his support was usually decisive. Likewise the various factions in the many Eastern schisms strove for favourable decisions from the Roman Bishop. In 260 Bishop Dionysius of Rome called the Patriarch of Alexandria to account for false doctrines. Even a Roman Emperor, Aurelian (270), declared that no one, not appointed by the "bishops of Italy and Rome," should remain in the See of Antioch.[4] As a result of these appeals, the power and authority of the Roman Bishop were magnified so that, gradually, he came to claim this exercise as his right, and, in addition, precedents were set which were to become ecclesiastical laws in the next period.[5]

10. The idea of one Catholic Church seems to have

[1] Cyprian, *Ep.* 49, 55. Greenwood, i., 168, thinks this quotation a later interpolation.

[2] Cyprian, *Ep.* 68.

[3] *Ibid.*, *Ep.* 67.

[4] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vii., 30.

[5] It must be remembered that Rome had no monopoly of these appeals and that her decisions were not always accepted in these early days. *Cf.* Greenwood, i., 171 *ff*

resulted from the intense struggle against the various forms of heresy, which had divided the early Christians into sects somewhat like the various Protestant denominations of to-day. This conception of ecclesiastical unity and universality had two sides: doctrine and ceremony. To teach the true doctrine and to perpetuate sacramental unity the priesthood was created. The persecutions emphasised the fundamental doctrines which united all Christians and made them conscious of this unity of belief. In order to enforce this uniformity the Bishop of Rome exercised the power of excommunication. Victor took it upon himself to excommunicate the Bishop of Ephesus and his fellow-officials for refusing to conform to the mode of celebrating Easter in the West (190). Irenæus emphasised the necessity and value of a spiritual unity in the Church,[1] and to "the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church" of Rome he conceded the most accurate apostolic tradition.[2] He declared that it was "a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority."[3] Tertullian spoke of the Catholic Church as if its eternal unity were a common concept.[4] It was left to Cyprian, however, to boldly hold up the occupant of the See of Rome as the representative of both the organised and the sacramental unity of the Church beyond which there could be no salvation. In his book on the *Unity of the Church,* Cyprian asked:

He that abideth not in the unity of the church, doth he

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, v., 23–25.
[2] Irenæus, *Against Heresy*, iii., 3.
[3] *Library of Ante-Nic. Fathers*, v.
[4] *Ibid.*, xv.

believe that he holdeth to the faith? He that struggleth against and resisteth this church, he that deserteth the Chair of St. Peter, upon which the church is founded, can he have any assurance that he is in the church? . . . Likewise . . . Paul teacheth the sacrament of unity saying: "There is one body and one spirit and one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God." . . . The episcopate is indeed one . . . the church also is one . . . there is also but one head and one source. . . . Whoever is excluded from the church . . . is severed from the promises of the church. . . . He is a stranger, an outcast, and enemy. He cannot have God for his father, who hath not the church for his mother. . . . He that doth not hold this unity doth not hold the law of God . . . he partaketh not of life or of salvation.[1]

The power of excommunication to preserve the doctrinal unity and purity of the Church implied some share in appointment and administration. From the very beginning, no doubt, the Bishop of Rome had ordained all provincial bishops, and few matters of great importance had been transacted without his consent or approval.[2]

The same tendencies and influences that led to the evolution of the bishop in the early local churches for the sake of order and efficiency, produced a centralisation of power in the universal Church. With the growth of the idea that the Church had an outward organisation developed the conscious need of a supreme bishop who could rule the Church somewhat as the Emperor ruled the state. That such a unifying authority was generally understood to exist by the time of Cyprian seems very clear from contemporary

[1] *Library of Ante-Nic. Fathers*, viii.
[2] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 192.

testimony. But it took two hundred and fifty years to develop that leadership. There were not wanting, either, on all sides evidences of earlier local independence. The rise of the Papacy was the logical culmination of the episcopal system. It must be remembered that by the time of Bishop Cyprian the Church had undergone a series of wonderful changes. The Church had spread outwardly until the whole Empire was covered and included all ranks. The Church had come to be naturalised in the Empire and was gradually compromising with conditions. Some conception of the part Christianity was to play in the world began to dawn on men's minds. The ascendency of the See of St. Peter was regarded, therefore, quite generally as a necessity.

11. The centralisation of wealth in Rome rendered the Church there the wealthiest in Christendom. These riches were lavishly used, during the first three hundred years, to aid the poorer communities.[1] Such favours could not be solicited, or received, without an appreciable sacrifice of independence on the part of the recipients. Ignatius, considering the munificence of the Roman Church, and wishing to confer some special distinction, calls her "the fostering mistress of charity."[2]

12. From the time of Peter to Constantine the Great, thirty-two bishops occupied the chair of the Prince of Apostles. The number and character of the members of the Roman Church led to the selection of the ablest of the Western Christians to occupy that important office. These successive bishops, from the weight of their personal influence, transmitted a gradually increasing power. The labours of a few of these remarkable

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, iv., 23; vii., 6.
[2] *To Corinth*, Ep. i., c. 44.

men who filled the Roman See, like Clement, Victor, Callistus, and Stephen, helped powerfully to lay the foundations for the Papacy. Clement's attitude was "almost imperious." Victor in his presumption on the Easter question, Zephyrinus on the assumption of his proud title of Pontifex Maximus and Bishop of Bishops, Callistus concerning lapsed heretics, and Stephen on the baptism of heretics, were all guilty of "hierarchical arrogance."[1] Cyprian (d.258) looked upon Rome as the *Cathedra Petri* and the Roman Church as the head of the universal Church.[2] Thus it may be accepted as an established fact that the Bishop of Rome was generally accepted as Peter's successor, at least in the West, when Emperor Constantine legalised the Christian religion and made it free to complete its organisation and to carry on its propagandism openly. He also increased the wealth and power of the Roman See and made its bishop the undisputed head of the Western Church. At the same time, in removing his capital to Constantinople, Constantine permitted the Roman Bishop to assume imperial prerogatives and encouraged the completion of the Church organisation after the imperial model.

A comparison of the Church in 313 with the Apostolic Church reveals the fact that many pronounced changes and developments had occurred. In extent the Roman Church had spread from the Eternal City over the entire Italian peninsula and then to Spain, France, England, Germany, and Africa, and numbered perhaps 10,000,000 members. In organisation the Church had changed from a democracy to an absolute monarchy, from many local centres of authority to one great

[1] Schaff, iii., 351.

[2] *Ep.* 43: 5; 55: 8; 59: 14; *Lib. of Ante-Nic. Fathers*, viii.

world power based on an imperial hierarchy, from communism to paternalism, from decentralisation to centralisation, from apostolic simplicity to worldly grandeur, and from a spiritual organisation to one largely political. The spiritual shepherd of the flock at Rome had come to claim and to exercise superior prerogatives over Western Europe and to serve the Roman Emperor as virtually his spiritual adviser. In wealth and culture, too, the Church had become a powerful social, industrial, and educational factor.

In institutions, rites, and ceremonies, as well as in organisation, the Church of the third and fourth centuries was very different from that of the first. A pompous ritualism with suggestions of image worship had been introduced.[1] Great emphasis had come to be laid upon the sanctity and power of holy water,[2] sacred relics and places, pilgrimages, and the use of the cross.[3] The development of new ideas in reference to the merit of external works resulted in asceticism and a celibate priesthood, fanatical martyrdom, indiscriminate almsgiving, and various patent methods for spiritual benefits. At the same time the number of Church festivals had greatly increased and now included Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany, and various saints' days.[4]

These new ideas and practices naturally gave the priest the lofty position of mediator between God and man. A differentiation in the ministry gradually crept in as an outcome of the hierarchical spirit. The Bishop of Rome was elevated above all bishops as

[1] *Apost. Const.*, viii., 6–15; Alzog, i., §§92, 93.
[2] *Apost. Const.*, viii., 28.
[3] Alzog, § 95.
[4] *Ibid.*, § 93.

God's chosen representative on earth. The bishops were exalted above all the presbyters or priests. The priests in turn held a position far superior to the subordinate officials, who had now come to include sub-deacons, readers, acolytes, precentors or cantors, janitors, exorcists,[1] and other officials of minor importance.[2] These under officers likewise were cut off from the laity by a pronounced gulf.[3]

To conduct the general affairs of the Church, synods and councils of the clergy came into existence as early as the second century.[4] Roman or Greek assemblies may have suggested the form of the synod, though it is more probable that they sprang spontaneously out of the needs of the Church. These meetings at first were irregular and very informal and resulted either in resolutions with no binding force on the dissentient minority, or in a letter. There were four classes of councils: (1.) The synod of a single diocese which probably existed from the beginning. (2.) The provincial council of the bishops of several dioceses. This type began early in the second century. (3.) General councils consisting of the bishops of several provinces. (4.) Universal councils representing the whole Church. When Constantine gave Christianity legal recognition, councils became more common for the purpose of formulating common rules and dogmas, as for instance Arles (314). After the Council of Nicæa in 325 the validity of earlier decisions was recognised and given the force of imperial law. Thus had the councils

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., 43.

[2] Alzog, i., 393.

[3] Hatch, *Org. of the Early Christ. Churches*, 143 *ff.*

[4] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, v., 16; Tertullian, *De Jejunus*, 13; Cyprian, *Ep.* 75; Hatch, *Org. of the Early Christ. Churches*, 169, 170.

changed in a few years from local to general, from recommending to sovereign bodies.[1]

Paralleling this remarkable evolution in the organisation of the Church was a marked departure from the simplicity and purity of the early Christian life on the part of both clergy and laity. The "Apostolical Constitutions," the "Canons of the Holy Apostles," and the decrees of the councils of Elvira (306), Arles (314), Neo-Cæsarea (314), and Nicæa (325) all reveal the worldliness of the clergy in the laws passed against their engaging in worldly pursuits, frequenting taverns and gambling houses, accepting usury, habits of vagrancy, taking bribes, and immorality. Because the multitude of pagan converts were carrying their ideas and practices into the Church, many corrective measures were enacted against this degeneration. The licentiousness of the clergy became a still more crying sin among the laity, for it was unreasonable to expect the rank and file to be better than their leaders.

[1] *See* Hefele, *Hist. of Ch. Councils*, i., §1–17.

CHAPTER X

RISE OF THE PAPACY—*Continued*

THE growth of the Papacy from 313 to 604 was very marked and may be traced with little difficulty. In fact from the fourth century onward the proofs that papal supremacy was both asserted and recognised are so numerous that it is only necessary to select typical cases and illustrations. Certain formative influences and forces noticeable in the period prior to 313 were continued into the later epoch and will be considered in order here.

1. The missionary zeal of the Roman Church accomplished wonders. By the fourth century Spain and Gaul had sufficient Christians to warrant the division of the territory into bishoprics. Some of the Gallic bishops were imbued with a remarkably active spirit of propagandism, notably, St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (350–66), who fought the Arians incessantly; Honoratus, Bishop of Arles, who inspired others to labour; St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, called the "Apostle to the Gauls," and St. Denis, Bishop of Paris, who suffered martyrdom for the cause. Similar workers were found in Spain. About the same time Celtic missionaries from the north were working southward to join the work spreading northward from Rome. Columba laboured among the Scots and Picts; Aidan, in Northumbria; Columbanus, with the Burgundians;

Gallus, in Switzerland; and Amania and Kilian in Thuringia. From Rome went forth the famous missionary expedition to England under Augustine (596), which succeeded in winning the Anglo-Saxons to a belief in the Roman faith and to a recognition of Roman authority.

In return a counter-wave of missionary activity spread from England back to the continent, led by Wilfrid in Friesland; Willebrord around Utrecht; the Ewald brothers among the Saxons; Swidbert on the Ems and Yssel; Adelpert in Holland; and Boniface, the "Apostle to the Germans," among various Teutonic tribes. This widespread missionary work resulted in eventually bringing all Western Europe under the subjection of the Roman Church. Thus new blood, a more primitive enthusiasm, and an intense devotion were called to her service, and all powerfully aided the rise of the Papacy.

2. The continued orthodoxy of the Western Church made it a pillar of strength, and gave its head a commanding position in dealing with heresy and schism. To him, more than ever, did people East and West look for final decisions in disputed matters of doctrine,[1] and contested cases of jurisdiction, rank, territory, and authority. St. Jerome in eloquent words besought the "Sun of righteousness—in the West" to teach him the true doctrine because "here in the East all is weed and wild-oats."[2]

3. The claim of the Bishop of Rome to appellate jurisdiction, which had been exercised more or less from an early date, received a sweeping confirmation and a new impetus in 347 through the Council of Sardica.

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 118.

[2] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 232.

In 340, Athanasius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, the champion of orthodoxy, appealed to Julian I. from an unjust decision against him in the episcopal courts of the East. Julian I. called a council, to which he invited the Eastern bishops, who refused to attend, reversed the decision,[1] and completely acquitted Athanasius. He wrote a strong letter of reproof to the Arians in which he asserts Rome's canonical supremacy in initiating conciliar proceedings against ecclesiastical offenders.[2] The Council of Sardica confirmed the resolutions of the Roman Synod.[3]

It was decreed that any bishop, who might feel himself aggrieved by an unfair trial, could have the judges write to the Bishop of Rome asking for a new trial at which, if it seemed wise, priests representing the Bishop of Rome could be present.[4] Meanwhile, pending the trial, no successor to the office of the accused could be named. This action made the Bishop of Rome referee to decide, however, not the case itself, but whether there ought to be a new trial. The right was conferred "in honour of the memory" of St. Peter and hence it was soon claimed as an inherent prerogative of the apostolical See of the West. Later on it was positively asserted that these canons gave an appeal to the Church of Rome in all episcopal cases. Whatever the original intent may have been, the fact remains that this new power was an important factor in the evolution of papal supremacy. The Pope was given a power previously possessed exclusively by the

[1] It must be said, however, that the Eastern Patriarchs refused to recognise the decision. Gieseler, i., 382; Milman, i., 130. *Cf.* Socrates, ii., 15 *ff.*

[2] Hard., *Concil.*, i., p. 610 *ff.*

[3] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., 205.

[4] Can. 4, 5, 7.

Emperor.[1] In 378, Emperor Gratian added civic sanction to the judicial authority of the Bishop of Rome by compelling accused bishops to go to Rome for trial.[2] Ultimate appellate jurisdiction was definitely assigned to the Pope by Emperor Valentinian III. in 445, when, of his own motion, causes could be called to Rome for papal decision.[3] Emperor Gelasius (496) approved in very positive terms the judicial supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.[4] And Gregory the Great (604) assumed it as an indisputable fact that every bishop is subject to the See of Peter.[5]

After this period cases were continually referred to Rome for adjustment. St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea, appealed to Damasus I., the latter part of the fourth century, for protection. In 398 the Emperor ordered Flavian of Antioch to proceed to Rome for trial. He refused to go, but compromised with the Pope. St. John Chrysostom, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and head of the whole Eastern Church, early in the fifth century, appealed to Innocent I. against the persecutions of Empress Eudoxia and for restoration to his see.[6] Apiarius, a priest of Africa, appealed to Pope Zosimus against the censure of his bishop in 416. The Pope vindicated the priest against his bishop, and ordered the latter either to revoke the

[1] The Council of Sardica was not recognised, however, either by the churches of the East or of Africa.

[2] Mansi, iii., 624.

[3] Cod. Theod. *Novell.*, tit. xxix., Suppl., p. 12; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 72. The same power was conferred by the Council of Chalcedon (451) on the Bishop of Constantinople. *Canon* 9.

[4] *Ep.* 13; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 72.

[5] *Ep.* 9.

[6] Greenwood, i., 270–279.

censure or to appear at Rome for trial.[1] St. Augustine's letter to Pope Celestine in 424 shows that it was a common thing to refer disputes to Rome for settlement.[2] Both St. Cyril and the Nestorians appealed to Pope Celestus, who decided in favour of St. Cyril. Theodoret, the Church historian, when condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 449, appealed to Leo I., who asserted that he could hear appeals from any source as a court of first and last resort.[3] These appeals, and many other similar cases, which could be cited both East and West,[4] show the growing power of the Roman Pope, and enabled him to make real the theory of his supremacy. To enable the successor of St. Peter to adjudicate cases more easily, vicars were appointed in various parts of the papal empire to decide finally on all cases not reserved by the Pope. This arrangement greatly enlarged papal jurisdiction by encouraging and facilitating appeals.

4. The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organisation. The Bishop of Rome, in the seat of the Cæsars, was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the political as well as the spiritual head. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favoured the evolution of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the

[1] Hard., *Concil.*, i., 947.
[2] *Ep.* 209.
[3] *Ep.* 4, c. 5.
[4] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 139.

successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognised the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasised and magnified after 313. The importance of this fact must not be overlooked. The organisation of the Church was thus put on the same divine basis as the revelation of Christianity. This idea once accepted led inevitably to the mediæval Papacy. The priesthood came, in consequence, to assume all the powers of the great Founder. The Mosaic forms, as well as the Roman Empire, suggested convenient models and authoritative examples for the new structure. It is not difficult to detect in the oligarchical Church polity of the fourth and fifth centuries a yearning for unity. It was but natural, therefore, that Rome should boldly take the remedy into her own hands and pose as the authorised representative of the visible unity demanded by the Christian world. The position Rome had already attained and the worthy part played in the organisation and spread of the gospel gave her a superior advantage, and enabled, nay compelled, her bishop to become the one high-priest, the "universal bishop."

5. In the fourth and fifth centuries the Petrine theory was generally accepted by the Church Fathers East and West.[1] The theory had become a dogmatic principle of law founded upon historical facts. Optatus, the African Bishop of Mileve (c. 384), strongly asserted the visible unity of the Church and the im-

[1] Berington and Kirk, *Faith of Catholics*, ii., 1–112.

movable *Cathedra Petri*, with the Roman Bishop as Peter's successor.[1] Ambrose of Milan (d. 397) gave the Bishop of Rome the same position in the Church that the Emperor had in the Empire,[2] and recognised him as the great champion of orthodoxy, but at the same time called Peter's primacy one of confession and faith, not of rank. He put Paul on an equality with Peter. Jerome (d. 419) recognised the Pope as the successor of Peter and said, "Following none but Christ, I am associated in communion with . . . the chair of Peter. On that rock I know the Church to be built."[3] Innocent I. (414) made a magnificent defence of the theory. Augustine (d. 430), the greatest of the Latin Fathers, admitted the primacy of Peter and recognised the Roman Bishop as his successor.[4] In his remarkable book, the *City of God*, he did more than all the Fathers to idealise Rome as the Christian Zion. Maximus of Turin (d. 450) and Orosius (d. 5th century) bore similar testimony. The Greek Fathers uniformly spoke of Peter in lofty terms as the "Prince of Apostles," the "Tongue of the Apostles," the "bearer of the keys," the "keeper of the kingdom of Heaven," the "Pillar," the "Rock," *et cetera*, but they held generally that Peter's primacy was honorary, and that he transferred his power to both the Bishop of Antioch and the Bishop of Rome.[5] But these modifications of the Petrine theory did not arrest the evolution of the papal power. The important historical

[1] Migne, xi.; Optatus, lib. ii., c. 2, 3; lib. vii., c. 3. Mileve is in Numidia.

[2] *De Excidio Satyri*, i., 47; Mansi, *Concil.*, iii., cal. 622.

[3] Jerome, *Ep.* 15, 146; Greenwood, i., 232.

[4] *Ps. contra Don.; Ep.* 178; Greenwood, i., 296.

[5] Ignatius, *Martyrs*, n. 4; Hom. ii. in *Principium Actorum*, n. 6, iii., p. 70; Theodoret, *Ep.* 83, 113, 116; Cyril, *Ep. ad Coelest.*

fact to be taken into account is, that the *belief* in the supremacy of St. Peter's successor was quite generally recognised and accepted.

6. The growth of conciliar prerogatives tended to advance the development of papal authority. The Council of Nicæa (325) gave the Western Church the Nicene Creed, practically made the Bishop of Rome its defender, and recognised him as the sole Patriarch of the West with ten provinces as his diocese.[1] The Council of Sardica (343), in reality only a local Western body, decreed that deposed bishops might appeal to the Bishop of Rome for a new trial, that vacant bishoprics could not be filled till his decision was received, and that he could delegate his power to a local synod. This gave him a kind of appellate and revisory jurisdiction in the case of deposed bishops even in the East.[2] It is claimed that this was a new grant for a specific case and in deference to Pope Julian alone. This power was confirmed by Emperors Valentinian I. (364–375) and Gratian (375–383).[3] In this manner the Roman Popes were furnished the opportunity to claim universal jurisdiction. The Council of Aquileia (381) begged Emperor Gratian to protect "the Roman Church, the head of the whole Roman world and that sacred faith of the Apostles."[4] The African councils of Carthage and Mileve (416) sent their actions against Pelagius to Innocent I., for his approval. The councils of Ephesus

[1] Canon 6; Gieseler, i., 378. Later an interpolation made canon 6 read: "Rome has always held the primacy." First used at Chalcedon in 451.

[2] Canons 3, 4, and 5; Mansi, iii., 23; Sardica was not a universal council.

[3] Milman, i., 101. *Cf.* Hefele, i., 539; Greenwood, i., 239, 240.

[4] Mansi, *Concil.*, iii., cal. 622.

(431) and Chalcedon (451) gave the Bishop of Rome a primacy in rank and honour, which he soon made a primacy in power.[1] The latter body recognised the necessity of obtaining the Pope's confirmation to insure legality. Here again the Bishop of Rome had usurped a prerogative claimed by Constantine and his successors. Later the Popes called most of the councils, presided over them in person or through legates, and confirmed their proceedings in order to give them legality.

7. The power of excommunication, an authority inherent in all societies, was early developed and exercised by the Roman Bishop. This right was clearly recognised in the New Testament.[2] The power of excommunication was originally put into the hand of the local bishops. They expanded the biblical precepts into a penal code, and assumed the right to act as judges and to pronounce censure or final excommunication. The apostolic constitutions and canons reveal a direct substitution of the authority of the bishops for that of Christ in these particulars. Excommunication, for the first three centuries of the Christian era, was looked upon as a remedial and corrective measure to prevent a breach of discipline, disobedience, and heresy. It is a significant fact, therefore, that the Roman bishops, by the third century, claimed the power to put out of communion, not only individuals, but whole communities, who did not conform to Roman usages and beliefs, even though the sentence could not always be enforced. Innocent I., imbued by the lofty idea of the prerogatives of his office, did not hesitate to pronounce sentence of excommunication

[1] Gieseler, i., 385, 395, 396; Schaff, iii., 313.

[2] Matt. xvi., 19; xviii., 18; 1 Cor. v., 3–5; 2 Cor. vi., 14, 17; Rom. xvi., 17; Gal. i., 8, 9; Tit. iii., 10; 1 Thess. iii., 6, 14, 15.

against the heretics, Pelagius and his pupil Cœlestius.[1] Thus the right of universal censure grew and Rome came to have her own officers to execute the law.

8. From the fifth century onward the title of "papa" or "pope" was unvaryingly used by the bishops of Rome. This title is an abbreviation of the words "pater patrum"—father of fathers—and was at first given as a title of respect to ecclesiastics generally. In the Eastern churches it has continued to the present day, and in the Roman Church the general use of "father" may be regarded as the continuation of a variation of the original word. The next step in the early Church was the restriction of the term "papa" as a special title for bishops. By the fourth century it had been gradually reserved for the metropolitans and patriarchs. After the fifth century it was claimed and borne as the badge of the supreme rank of the successor of St. Peter among the churches of Christendom. Not until 1073, however, did Gregory VII. formally prohibit the assumption of the title by other ecclesiastics. This unique transfer of a distinction first from all to a few, and then from a few to one, indicates a concentration of rank, dignity, and power in the one thus distinguished. A term, originally one of filial respect and reverence, becomes one of authority. The name and the office react on each other.

9. The letters of the Roman bishops gradually came to be regarded in the Western Church as apostolic ordinances, and laid the foundation for the vast ecclesiastical legal system.[2] Siricius (384–398) wrote the first decretal which had the force of law.[3] A typical

[1] Hard., *Concil.*, i., 1025.
[2] Gieseler, i., 382; Milman, i., 129.
[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 68.

illustration of the character and power of papal letters is seen in the commanding communication of Pope Celestine sent in 428 to the bishops of Vienne and Narbonne concerning ceremonial abuses in their provinces. "Inasmuch," he wrote, "as I am appointed by God to watch over the whole Church, it is my duty everywhere to root out evil practices and to substitute good ones; for my pastoral superintendence is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where the name of Christ is known and adored."[1] The Gallic churches received this pronouncement without a whisper of disapproval. The Council of Chalcedon (451) accepted a letter from Leo I., settling a disputed point in theology.[2] Gelasius I. (494) instructed Emperor Anastasius on the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal power.[3] The decretals of Gregory the Great spoke with a bold, undisputed authority.[4]

10. The Edict of Milan in 313 did not make Christianity the state religion, but merely put it on a legal equality with paganism. It was not long, however, until this new status enabled Christianity to outstrip its old rival and actually become the constitutional faith. State patronage prepared the way for a conscious and natural adaptation and assimilation of forms of imperial polity. Accordingly the admonition of the early period assumed the tone of mandates; interferences, whether for advice or arbitration, took the character of appeals, rescripts, and ordinances; and the model of discipline and ritual for all churches emanated from Rome.

[1] Bower, i., 383.
[2] *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xii., 70, Letter 43.
[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 72.
[4] *Ibid.*, 73.

11. Constantine, fully aware of the pre-eminence and power of the Roman Church, took special pains to bestow upon it his imperial munificence. The Bishop of Rome was transferred from a humble dwelling to a spacious palace, possibly to the Lateran, owned to this day by the Pope. Confiscated property was restored and money donated. Splendid churches were erected.[1] With grateful hearts the Christians gladly accepted the sovereignty of the Emperor. As Roman citizens there was no conception in their minds of the spiritual government of the Church independent of the imperial power. When Constantine called councils like Arles and Nicæa, heard appeals, made appointments, and legislated for the Church it was all accepted as a matter of course. The Church of Rome gained obviously more than any other spiritual body-corporate of the Christian world. This advantage, coupled with the wide-reaching claims set forth for at least two centuries, carried her by a mighty leap far above all other churches and made her head, in theory and fact, if not in name, the Pope. Thus all the contentions of the Petrine claim of ecclesiastical government fell into a natural harmony with the plans of the Empire. The rise of provincial churches corresponded to the provincial system of the Empire. The elevation of the Bishop of Rome to a primacy over all churches created a counterpart to the Emperor. The union of the Empire and Papacy was not only easy and natural—it was inevitable.

12. No sooner did the Church rise from persecution to a great world power than the necessity was felt everywhere of some central authority to preserve its unity. The divisions in the Arian controversy clearly revealed

[1] Lateran, Vatican, St. Paul, St. Agnes, St. Lawrence, and St. Marcellinus.

that need. The Emperor, in a way, sought to meet the requirement, but, when he failed, he called the Council of Nicæa to serve that end. A universal council might be of great service in a crisis but it could not easily be in perpetual session. The Roman Church saw its chance at this juncture and embraced every opportunity to pose as the supreme unifying power in Christendom. It was a long and not always an easy struggle, but the effort was at length successful. It was not long after the day of Constantine that it may be said that the Church had gained control of the Empire. That conquest gave the Church an unprecedented pre-eminence. In this movement the Church of Rome played the leading role. The next great problem was to enable the Pope to get control of the Church and in this way wield absolute sway over the Christianised Empire, or, to state it the other way, over the imperialised Church.

Nothing seems clearer, after taking into account all the factors, than that the rise of papal power was a natural, logical, historical process which began with the planting of the Church in Rome. Numerous incidents mark the different stages of development to show that every new assumption of papal prerogative was disputed and contested. Indeed nothing more distinctly marks the growth of papal authority than the fact that these protests were so numerous and so widely scattered.

In the beginnings of ecclesiastical organisation bishops enjoyed and exercised an equality of power and rank. The persistence of this idea may be seen long after the period of Constantine. But hierarchical tendencies began very early and are very conspicuous in connection with Rome. In the opening decades of the

history of the Church it was customary for Christians eminent in station or piety to address letters, advisory or hortatory, to other churches on general points of creed or discipline, or on special local questions. Thus wrote Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, and others. Not infrequently churches appealed to prominent bishops for assistance and advice. Often one bishop would censure another for the manifestation of unwarranted assumptions. Thus Irenæus reprehended Victor for excommunicating the heretical bishops of Asia and did it as an equal.[1] Tertullian, after he joined the heretical Montanists, scornfully denies the powers claimed by the Bishop of Rome by asking, "How comes it that you take to yourself the attribute of the Catholic Church?" He answers by denying the whole Petrine theory.[2] Hippolytus, Bishop of Pontus, in a controversy with Calixtus I., shows how the claim of the Bishop of Rome was denied in the beginning of the third century.[3] Origen also repudiated the Petrine claims.[4] While the great Cyprian did so much to create the concept of the one Catholic Church under the leadership of Rome, yet, at the same time, he strongly asserted episcopal equality and independence.[5]

This important historical fact must never be forgotten in considering the rise of the Papacy, namely, that the change was not directly from democracy to monarchy, but from democracy indirectly through oligarchy to monarchy. In addition to the instances of episcopal equality and independence already given,

[1] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, v., 24.
[2] *On Modesty*, in *Lib. of Ante-Nic. Fathers*, xviii.
[3] Hippolytus, *Refutation of Heresies*, ix., 7.
[4] Greenwood, i., 109.
[5] *Ibid.*, 121 *ff.*

the Apostolic Canons in canon 35 ordered each province to determine for itself which one of its churches should hold the primacy. This idea persisted long after the time of Constantine and, indeed, the Council of Antioch in 341 repeats the rule as if recognising a long established regulation. The Council of Nicæa in 325, while assigning the highest rank to the Apostolic Sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, at the same time reserved to every province the rights of its own church. In the second universal council held in 381 at Constantinople, when the great provinces of the Church were defined and the honourable primacy of Rome clearly asserted, no interference was allowed with the autonomy of the provincial churches.

In the West, however, local autonomy and provincial primacy were not so much emphasised as in the East. Rome and St. Peter's successor residing there early established a predominance over Spain, Gaul, and Britain. In Africa, Carthage for the most part obeyed Rome, and in Italy, Ravenna and Milan occasionally showed stubborn resistance.

13. The civil government naturally approved a system of Church polity which was in harmony with that of the state. It is no surprise, therefore, that imperial edicts supported the lofty position of the Bishop of Rome.[1] Did he not represent the Church of the great Empire and the faith of the Emperor himself? Besides it was always easiest to deal with him as a representative of the entire Church. In fact there was a sentiment in the Church that it was much better to carry on all business with imperial authorities through him. To this end the Council of Sardica in 347 decreed that all prelates visiting Rome for the purpose of obtaining

[1] Boyd, W. K., *Eccles. Edicts of the Theodos. Code*, N. Y., 1906.

civic favours should present their petitions through the Bishop of Rome.[1] Theodosius (380) commanded that all subjects "should hold that faith which the divine Peter, the Apostle, delivered to the Roman Bishop."[2] Valentinian III. (445) commanded all bishops to recognise the Bishop of Rome as their leader in both judicial and administrative matters.[3] Later Emperors lavished on the Roman Church wealth, immunities, and exemptions which greatly enhanced its power and magnified the importance of its head.[4]

Justinian, in a decree of 532, declared that he had been very diligent in subjecting all the clergy of the East to the Roman See. He also expressed a firm resolution never to allow any business affecting the general welfare of the Church to be transacted, without notifying the head of all the churches.[5] Such a positive and sweeping assertion by such a powerful ruler shows the height to which papal power had climbed by the sixth century. Pope John II. was highly pleased with the useful acknowledgment of Justinian, complimented him on his "perfect acquaintance with ecclesiastical law and discipline," and added: "preserving the reverence due the Roman See, you have subjected all things unto her, and reduced all churches to that unity which dwelleth in her alone, to whom the Lord, through the Prince of the Apostles, did delegate all power; . . . and that the Apostolic See is in verity the head of all churches, both the rules of the fathers and the statutes of the princes do manifestly

[1] Can. 9. Later the same procedure was adopted at Constantinople.

[2] Cod. Theod., c. 16.

[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 72.

[4] Greenwood, i., 324.

[5] Cod. Justin., i., tit. 2.

declare, and the same is now witnessed by your imperial piety."[1]

The emancipation of the Church and the great inflow of wealth and pagan converts wrought a woeful change in its character and habits. A heathen historian declared that candidates would stoop to any means to secure the pontifical office because "the successful candidate gains the opportunity of fattening upon the oblations of matrons; of being conveyed about in stall-carriages; of appearing in public in costly dresses; of giving banquets so profuse as to surpass even royal entertainments."[2] The Fathers of the Church like Hilary, Jerome, and Basil deplored the vices, thus rebuked, in terms of even greater severity.

14. The barbarian invasions on the whole strengthened both the spiritual and temporal supremacy of the Holy See. They gave the death blow to paganism in Rome.[3] Once converted to Roman Christianity, the Germans became the staunch supporters of the papal hierarchy and enabled the Pope to enforce his prerogatives in the West.[4] Backed by these sturdy Teutons, the Pope became the most powerful individual in Christendom and soon declared his independence of the Byzantine court.

15. Another factor of no small moment was the extraordinary ability of some of the successors of St. Peter. Among them were men of commanding leadership, men of brains and faith, fearless administrators, aggressive judges, and men conscious of the tremendous part the Papacy was destined to play in the world's history. Conscious of their own power, and standing

[1] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, ii., 137.
[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxvii., c. 3.
[3] Gieseler, i., 219; Schaff, iii., 68, 69.
[4] Hutton, W. H., *The Church and the Barbarians*, N. Y., 1906.

on their lofty assumptions, they took advantage of every condition and circumstance to increase their authority and prerogatives. Thus the office of the Bishop of Rome continually grew in power and jurisdiction. Julian I. (337–352), the supporter of Athanasius, held lofty ideas of his power as Pope[1] and gave his famous decision on the eucharist in the Council of Sardica (343).[2] Damascus (366–384), a staunch defender of orthodoxy and champion of celibacy, insisted on the recognition of his jurisdiction over East Illyricum, and, as a warm friend of Jerome, established the authority of the Vulgate.[3] Siricius (385–398) upheld the jurisdiction of the Holy See and issued the first decretal now extant.[4] In legislating about discipline and abuses in the Spanish Church his words were intended to convey universal authority on baptism, marriage, and celibacy. Speaking in conscious virtue of the authority of the Apostolic See he said: "We bear the burdens of all that are heavy laden; nay, rather the blessed Apostle Peter bears them in us, who, as we trust, in all things protects and guards us, the heirs of his administration."

Innocent I. (402–417) accepted, as a matter of unquestioned right, all that had been claimed by his predecessors, and surpassed all of them by the wide range of his pretensions. He sought to obliterate all distinction between advice and command. He spoke in a dogmatic and imperative tone on all questions pertaining to doctrine, discipline, and government in the Church of the West. "It is notorious to all the world," he said, "that no one save St. Peter and his

[1] *Apolog. contra Arian*, 21–26; Euseb., Soc., and Soz.
[2] Smith and Wace, iii., 532.
[3] *Ibid.*, i., 783.
[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 68.

successors have instituted bishops and founded churches in all the Gauls, in Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the adjacent islands."[1] Nor did the West deny the maternity of Rome. Consequently he asserted complete jurisdiction over Illyria, assumed that the African churches were dependent upon the See of Rome, formulated fourteen rules for the Gallic bishops, settled controversies in Spain, and manifested a lofty attitude toward the churches of the East. He played a prominent part in repelling the attacks of the barbarians on Rome.[2] He was the first to claim a general prerogative, as "the one single fountain-head which fertilises the whole world by its manifold streamlets," to revise the judgment of provincial synods[3] and thus to legislate by his own fiat for the whole Church. As the great guardian of orthodoxy, he condemned Pelagius and excommunicated him. "Unstained in life, able and resolute, with a full appreciation of the dignity and prerogatives of his see, he lost no opportunity of asserting its claims; and under him the idea of universal papal supremacy, though as yet somewhat shadowy, appears already to be taking form."

"The first Pope in the proper sense of the word" was Leo I., called the Great (440–461). "In him the idea of the Papacy . . . became flesh and blood. He conceived it in great energy and clearness, and carried it out with the Roman spirit of dominion so far as the circumstance of the time at all allowed."[4]

[1] Hard., *Concil.*, i., 995.

[2] Milman, i., 143, 4.

[3] *1st Epist.*, ii., ch. 3; Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.*, 133; Hard., *Concil.*, i., 1025.

[4] Smith and Wace, iii., 652; *Post-Nicene Fathers*, xii.; Greenwood, i., bk. 2, ch. 4–6; Milman, i., bk. 2, ch. 4; Schaff, iii., 314.

Before his elevation to the Papacy in 440 very little is known about Leo. His place of birth, nationality, and early education are all shrouded in obscurity. For ten years prior to his election, Leo was perhaps the most prominent man in Rome and noted for his learning and piety. While absent on a civil mission in Gaul, he was chosen Pope. At that time the Empire was in a very weak condition. Women, surrounded by their court of eunuchs and parasites, ruled at Constantinople and Ravenna. Barbarians were pressing in from all sides. Heresies rent the East and ignorance was fast covering the West. Western Christendom must be consolidated and disciplined so that it could meet the crudeness and heresy of the powerful invaders and overcome both. The See of St. Peter must replace the tottering imperial power. The law of Rome must once more be obeyed over the Empire, but this time as the ecclesiastical law. Leo was the only great man in Church or state, so the burden was thrust upon his shoulders.

Leo possessed those qualifications which made him the master spirit of his age and the "Founder of the mediæval Papacy." Lofty in his aims, severe and pure in life, of indomitable courage and perseverance, inspired by a fanatical belief in the Petrine theory, uncompromisingly orthodox, the great first theologian in the Roman Chair, he made the first clear-cut exposition of the extreme limits and prerogatives of the mediæval Papacy.[1] He asserted and exercised the superabounding power of the Pope to regulate every

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, *Source-Book of Med. Hist.*, No. 35. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xii., contains his life and letters. See sermon by Leo I. on Peter's leadership in Robinson, *Readings*, i., 69; Orr, *Source Book*, § 10.

department of Church government without any human limitations. Driven on by a dream of the universal dominion of Rome and Christianity, a great orator who swayed the Romans at will, he acted as a resolute Christian monarch conscious of his divine mission. Possessed of a capacity for complex rule, an extraordinary organiser and administrator, he used all his ability to make Christianity and the Papacy the one great world power. Twice he saved Rome from the barbarians, once in 452 when Attila, King of the Huns, was persuaded to withdraw without attacking the city, and again in 455 when the Vandal leader, Genseric, was induced to spare the capital from fire and murder. He drove heresy out of Italy and suppressed it in Spain. He forced the African Christians to submit to his authority (443), regained the papal power lost in East Illyria, compelled the Gallic bishops to obey his mandates,[1] and even asserted his supremacy over the Eastern Church. Through a legate he presided over the fourth ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, guided its theological discussions, and was "the finisher of the true doctrine of the presence of Christ."

Pope Leo laid the greatest possible emphasis upon the fact that there is one God, one Church, one universal bishop, one faith, and one interpreter of that faith, and that the recognition of this basic fact alone could bring unity and efficiency to Christendom. He very wisely cultivated a close alliance with the state and secured from Valentinian III. the promulgation of an imperial edict in 445, which raised him to the exalted position of "spiritual director and governor" of the

[1] Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, was excommunicated and Emperor Valentinian III. was induced to uphold the action. Greenwood, i., 351 *ff.*

Universal Church. Thus the Pope would issue his laws for the Church, just as the Emperor did for the Empire.

After Leo the Great, who died in 461, no important Pope filled the Chair of St. Peter until the time of Gregory I., called the Great (590–604). If Leo drew the outline of the mediæval Papacy, Gregory made it a living power. He issued the first declaration of independence and assumed actual jurisdiction over the whole Western Church. His high ideal was completely realised so that even Gibbon calls his pontificate the most edifying period of Church history.[1]

Gregory I. was born at Rome in 540 of a rich, pious, senatorial family. His great-grandfather was Pope Felix II. (483–492). His father was a wealthy lawyer and senator. His mother and two aunts were canonised. He was very well educated for that period as a "saint among the saints" as John the Deacon, his biographer, declared. In grammar, rhetoric, and logic he was second to none in Rome.[2] He studied law preparatory to public life and was well versed in the inspiring history of Rome and in current events. At thirty he was a distinguished senator and three years later Emperor Justin II. made him Prætor of Rome.

From his mother Gregory inherited a profound religious temperament, hence he naturally became imbued with the ascetic religious ideas of the age. The monastic crusade of the West, now at its height, found

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, iv., 421; *Nicene* and *Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., xii., contains Gregory's letters and sermons; Gregory of Tours; Bede; Snow, *St. Gregory the Great;* Barmby, *Gregory the Great;* Hutton, *Church of the Sixth Century;* Neander, iii., 112; Hallam, 328.

[2] Gregory of Tours, x., 1.

him a willing convert. Upon his father's death, Gregory used his vast wealth for charity and for founding seven monasteries. Persuaded by his pious mother, he himself became a monk in 575. Selling all his costly furniture, fine clothes, and jewels for the poor, he turned his own house into a monastery and almost killed himself by his vigorous fasts and ascetic vigils. Soon he gained great fame as a monk, was chosen abbot, founded six monasteries in Sicily and enforced a tyrannical discipline.[1]

Gregory was a man of too great ability, however, to be penned up in a monastery; consequently Pope Benedict called him to his court as one of the seven deacons of Rome. In 579 he was sent, as a papal nuncio, to Constantinople to reconcile the Emperor and the Pope and to unite the Eastern and Western churches, while at the same time he was instructed to solicit military aid against the troublesome Lombards. For six years he remained at Constantinople on this mission and gained much fame as a theologian and diplomat. Although he failed to reunite the two branches of the Christian Church, he did bring about an amicable understanding between the Pope and the Emperor and got some help against the Lombards. In a discussion with the Patriarch of Constantinople over the nature of the body after resurrection, Gregory won a signal victory. During his stay in the East he wrote his renowned work *Magna Moralia*. In 585 he returned to Rome, resumed his duties as abbot,

[1] Soon many poetical tales were imputed to him. It was said a new stomach was given him so he could fast. An angel visited him disguised as a sailor. Milman, ii., 45. Read Bede for the story which led to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. For his treatment of the monk Justus see Milman, i., 432. *Cf.* Montalembert, ii., 84–87; *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, ii., 779.

became a popular preacher, and was recognised generally as the most able man in the Church.

When Pope Pelagius II. died in 590, the western part of Europe was in a very critical condition. The Teutonic barbarians had overrun the Empire from England around to Constantinople, destroying or burying nearly all that was best in the civilisation of old Rome. Justinian, to be sure, had recaptured Rome in 556, and it was to remain nominally under imperial rule until the time of Charles the Great (800), but the Emperor's hold on the West was limited and precarious. His representative, the exarch, lived mostly at Ravenna. The Pope, however, acknowledged the sovereignty of the Emperor both in theory and practice. As a result of the weakness and inactivity of the exarch, nearly all Italy lay prostrate before the fierce Lombards, and no efficient help came from the East.

The city of Rome was in a miserable condition. The Tiber had overflowed its banks and had swept away the granaries of corn, thus entailing famine and starvation. A dreadful pestilence had swept away thousands, among them the Pope himself. In a letter, Gregory compared the Roman See to an old shattered ship, letting in the waves on all sides, tossed by daily storms, its planks rotten and gnawed by rats—almost a wreck![1] An imperial organisation was needed to give Latin-Teutonic Europe the highest type of an organised, Christian civilisation under one law and one faith, and thus to preserve for future generations the best that was in old Greece and Rome, as well as the best that was in the Germans. "It is impossible to conceive

[1] *Epistle* v. in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, xii., 74.

what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages, without the mediæval Papacy."[1] A man of heart, power, and lofty purpose —a ruler who saw the opportunity and need of the Christian Church in Western Europe, who felt her new impulses, and who could guide her through a crucial period to a great and useful career—such a man the Roman senate, clergy, and people believed that they had found in the monk Gregory. He alone could save them from Teutonic anarchy, on the one hand, and from Roman decay on the other.

Although elected Pope unanimously by the senate, clergy, and people of Rome, Gregory did not want the office. He felt unworthy of it and feared its duties might lure him to worldliness—hence he fled the city and wrote the Emperor beseeching him not to confirm the election. But the Roman prefect intercepted the letter and sent instead a petition urging the confirmation. Gregory was captured at last and forcibly consecrated Supreme Pontiff. He was the best qualified man in all Christendom for the place. He represented the best in Rome and the best in Christianity. His comprehensive policy, his grasp of fundamental issues, his political training, his capacity for details, made him the man for the hour. He merged the office of Roman Emperor and Christian bishop into essentially one and thus became the real founder of the mediæval Papacy. His pontificate, therefore, was an era in the history of the Church.

Gregory's policy was to uphold and extend the Petrine theory to the utmost, although personally refusing the title of "Universal Bishop." He censured

[1] Milman, ii., 44.

the ambitious Patriarch of Constantinople for assuming that title and wrote to John of Syracuse: "With regard to the church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See? . . . The Apostolic See is the head of all churches."[1] To the Patriarch of Alexandria he wrote: "In the preface of the epistle . . . you have thought fit to make use of a proud title, calling me Universal Pope. But I beg your most sweet Holiness to do this no more."[2] Again he exclaimed: "Whoever calls himself Universal Bishop is Antichrist."[3] Gregory meant to exercise as much autonomy as possible in ruling the West but, at the same time, to submit to imperial authority in all instances of conflicting claims.[4] He planned to unify and purify the Church and to extend Christianity over the known world.

Under Gregory's able management papal power was consolidated and made supreme in Western Europe. He systematised papal theology, and perfected and beautified the Church liturgy until it took three hours to celebrate the mass.[5] He regulated the calendar of festivals. He checked heresies by driving Manichæism and Arianism out of Italy, Spain, and Gaul, and even advised the persecution of African Donatists (591). The Jews, however, were tolerated and efforts made to convert them. To get rid of simony he personally

[1] *Ep.*, ix., 12; xiii., 45.
[2] *Ep.*, viii., 30; ix., 12.
[3] Milman, ii., 72; *Ep.*, vii., 31.
[4] Milman, ii., 81.
[5] He created the Gregorian chant, instituted singing schools, minutely described the ceremonies, prescribed the variety and change of garments, and laid down the order of processions. The duties of priests and deacons were outlined and their parishes defined.

refused all presents and abolished all fees in his court. From priest to bishop he corrected the clergy and urged upon them celibacy.[1] He restored discipline throughout the Church and patronised all sorts of charity. He fought paganism fiercely by denouncing the Roman classics and even boasting of his own ignorance of them,[2] while at the same time he sent missionaries over most all of Western Europe. Monasticism, which he himself had adopted with all his heart, he encouraged and improved by restoring the early rigid discipline; by separating monks and clergy; by restricting admission to religious houses to persons above the age of eighteen years; by insisting on a probation of two years; by condemning deserters to life imprisonment; and by favouring the Benedictine Rule as the model. The papal court was reorganised, and clergy were substituted for boys and secular adults to attend the Pope. Even some efforts were made to check the European slave-trade.

In administrative power Gregory was perhaps inferior to Leo I. The Church was very wealthy, owning lands by this time all over Western Europe and in Africa. The Pope had to rule these vast estates as a mighty landlord. Subdeacons were his agents. Tenants were controlled politically as well as religiously. The surplus income was given to the clergy, papal domestics, monasteries, churches, cemeteries, almshouses, and hospitals. On the first of every month he distributed to the poor corn, wine, cheese, vegetables, oil, fish, meat, clothes, and money. The country was full of tramps and poor clergy; these he provided for and also supported impoverished nobles.[3] His letters

[1] *Ep.*, iii., 34, 50. [2] *Ep.*, xi., 54.

[3] It was also reported that he fed 3000 virgins.

are full of items about law-suits, disputes over weights and measures, collection of rents, emancipation of slaves, marriage of tenants, produce accounts, and a multitude of other affairs.

In addition to these multitudinous duties, he was virtual King of Italy. He denounced the corrupt exarch and drilled the Romans for military defence, though he always laboured for peace. He held the haughty Lombards in check and converted them to Christianity. He extended his authority over Africa, Spain, Gaul, England, and Ireland and even claimed jurisdiction over the East. He was the first Pope to become in act and in influence, if not in name, the temporal sovereign of the West. He paved the way for Hildebrand and Innocent III.

In culture Gregory was a true son of an age of credulity and superstition. He believed all the current tales about ghosts, miracles, and supernatural manifestations. The linen of St. Paul and his bondage-chains, he declared genuine and possessed of miracle-working power.[1] To the converted Visigothic King in Spain he sent a key made from Peter's chain, a piece of the true cross, and some hairs from the head of John the Baptist. Indeed this was a practice which he followed in the case of many of his friends whom he desired to especially favour.[2] The "monuments of classic genius" he despised, asserting that it was his wish to be unknown in this world and glorified in the next. He very severely censured the profane learning of a bishop who taught grammar, studied the Latin poets, and pronounced Jupiter and Christ in the same breath. It was his con-

[1] *Epistle* xxx. in *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, xii., 154.
[2] *Ibid.*, 82, 130, 243.

stant habit, on the other hand, to enforce upon all Christians — clergy and laity alike — the great duty of reading the Bible. Still his own literary work was rather voluminous. He wrote 850 letters — more than all his 69 predecessors together—on all topics and to all Christendom. In addition he produced his *Magna Moralia*,[1] some homilies, a book on pastoral rule, and liturgical treatises. His productions are below mediocrity and he cannot compare with Leo I. as a critic, expositor, or original thinker. He had but a slight knowledge of Greek and knew no Hebrew, nor did he possess a deep acquaintance with the Church Fathers. Yet for that age he was a cultured man and enjoyed a high reputation for piety and learning, and spoke to unborn generations.

"By his writings and the fame of his personal sanctity, by the conversion of England and the introduction of an impressive ritual, Gregory the Great did more than any other Pontiff to advance Rome's ecclesiastical authority."[2] His virtues and faults, his simplicity and cunning, his pride and humility, his ignorance and his learning—all were suited to the times and made him "the greatest of all the early Popes."[3] He closes the period of the Church Fathers and opens the Middle Ages. For 150 years there were no material acquisitions of ecclesiastical power, hence the history of the Papacy becomes very uninteresting and comparatively unimportant.[4]

When Gregory the Great closed his remarkable career (604) the Papacy of the Middle Ages had been

[1] This was an exposition of the Book of Job, *Ep.* 49.
[2] Bryce, 150.
[3] Adams, *Civ. of M. A.*, 230.
[4] Hallam, 329.

born and in form resembled the Empire.[1] The head of the Church was known as "Pope." Because of his peculiar personal holiness he could be judged by none,[2] though himself judge of all. The hierarchy of officers had been practically completed.[3] The laity was distinctly cut off from the clergy, and deprived of powers exercised in the first and second centuries. The election of the clergy had changed from a democratic to an aristocratic process. There was a marked evolution in rites and ceremonies. Art and music were now employed. The mass gradually became the powerful, mysterious centre of all worship, while public worship became imposing, dramatic, theatrical. Festivals were multiplied almost without number. The worship of martyrs and saints[4] became so widespread and popular that a "calendar of saints" was formed. Pilgrimages grew to be very numerous and the use of relics[5] developed such a craze that the fathers, councils, Popes, and at last the Emperor himself sought to check it. Religious pageants were multiplied and the use of images and pictures of saints were encouraged in the churches. The Virgin Mary was exalted to the eminence of divinity. In imitation of the court-calendar, loftier titles of spiritual dignity were adopted or invented for the higher ecclesiastics. The dogma of the "unity of outward representation"

[1] Gieseler, i., 382; Milman, i., 128.

[2] Hefele, iii., 20. In the early Church "pope," or "papa" or "abba," was applied to all clergy. Schaff, iii., 300. "Pope" is still used for all priests in the Greek Church and "father" in the Latin Church. See Cyprian, *Ep.*, viii., 1.

[3] Stewards, secretaries, nurses, and undertakers were regarded as being in a sense members of the lower clergy. Schaff, iii., 262.

[4] For biblical authority see Luke xv., 10; Rev. viii., 3, 4.

[5] Began in the second century.

had acquired not merely a material and visible, but also a sacramental, character. Thus the Church was the only channel of spiritual graces, hence union with the Church was absolutely indispensable to salvation. The Church had become immensely wealthy in lands, buildings, and furniture. This corrupting familiarity with secular affairs was early seen and denounced. St. Chrysostom sharply rebuked the bishops who "had fallen to the condition of land-stewards, hucksters, brokers, publicans, and pay-clerks." The Council of Chalcedon ordered the bishops to appoint land-stewards to look after their estates.[1]

SOURCES

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—*New Testament.*
2.—*New Testament Apocrypha.*
3.—Church Fathers. See Chap. X.
4.—Acts of the Councils. See Chap. IX.
5.—*Roman Civil Law.* Various English translations.
6.—*Canon Law.* Various collections. Best by Richter, 2 vols., Leip. 1839. No English translation.
7.—*Apostolical Constitutions.* Various English translations. Best in *Ante-Nic. Christ. Lib.*, vol. 17 *Cf.* Harnack, *Sources of the Apostolic Canons.* Lond., 1895.
8.—*Apostolic Canons.* Various English translations.
9.—Leo I., *Epistles to Flavian.* Transl. by C. A. Heurtley. Oxf., 1885. *Letters and Sermons. Lib. of Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, xii.
10.—Gregory I., *Book of Pastoral Rule and Selected Epistles. Ibid.*

Bibliographical note:—Unfortunately the best collections of materials have not been put

[1] Hard., *Concil.*, ii., 612.

into English, like: 1.—Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttum.* Leipz., 1895. 2.—Hardouin, *Acta Conciliorum.* Paris, 1815. 12 vols. 3.—Mansi, *Collectio Sacrorum Conciliorum.* Flor. & Ven., 1759–98. 31 vols. 4.—Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.* Leipz., 1881–8. 2 vols.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Allies, T. W., *The Holy See from Leo I. to Gregory I.* Lond., 1888.
2.—Balzani, U., *Early Chronicles of Italy.* Lond., 1883; i.–iii.
3.—Barry, W., *The Papal Monarchy.* N. Y., 1901.
4.—Bigg, *Church's Task under the Roman Empire.* Oxf., 1905.
5.—Borrow, I., *The Pope's Supremacy.* New ed. Lond., 1859.
6.—Bower, A., *History of the Popes.* Phil., 1844. 3 vols.
7.—Bright, W., *The Roman See in the Early Church.* Lond., 1890.
8.—Brock, M., *Rome: Pagan and Papal.* Lond., 1883.
9.—Bryce, J., *The Holy Roman Empire.* Many eds. Last ed. Lond. and N. Y., 1904.
10.—Creighton, M., *History of the Papacy.* Bost., 1882–94. Vol. i.
11.—Dudden, *Gregory the Great.* Lond. and N. Y., 1905. 2 vols.
12.—Duff, D., *The Early Church.* N. Y., 1891.
13.—Gasquet, *A Life of Pope Gregory the Great.* Lond., 1904.
14.—Gore, C., *Leo the Great.* Lond., 1878.
15.—Gosselin, J. E., *Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1853.
16.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* Lond., 1859–72. Vols. i.–ii.
17.—Hussey, R., *Rise of the Papal Power.* Lond., 1863.
18.—Kellett, F. W., *Pope Gregory the Great and his Relations with Gaul.* N. Y., 1890.

19.—Kenrick, F. P., *The Primacy of the Apostolic See.* 7th ed. Balt., 1855.
20.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.* Phil., 1883.
21.—Legge, A. O., *Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy.* Lond., 1870.
22.—Littledale, R. F., *The Petrine Claims.* Lond., 1889.
23.—Mann, H. K., *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages.* Lond., 1906.
24.—Manning, H. E., *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.* N. Y., 1880.
25.—Meyrick, T., *Lives of the Early Popes.* Lond., 1878–80. 2 vols.
26.—Milman, H. H., *Latin Christianity.* Lond., 1840. Several revisions.
27.—Murphy, *The Chair of Peter.* Lond., 1888.
28.—Pennington, A. R., *Epochs of the Papacy.* Lond., 1881. Ch. 1.
29.—Platnia, B., *Lives of the Popes.* Lond., 1893.
30.—Rainy, R., *The Ancient Catholic Church* (to 451).
31.—Riddle, J. E., *History of the Papacy.* Lond., 1854.
32.—Rivington, L., *The Roman Primacy* (430–451). Lond., 1899.
33.—Snow, T. B., *St. Gregory the Great.* Lond., 1892.
34.—Soechi, B., *Lives of the Popes to Gregory VII.* Lond., 1888.
35.—Tardini, C., *The Popes of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Churches.* Lond., 1871. Ch. 4.
36.—Wilkes, G. A. T., *History of the Popes from Linus to Pius IX.* Lond., 1851.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, *Civ.*, ch. 4. Adeney, ch. 11. Allies, *Peter's Rock*, vol. iv., ch. 32–34, 38, 42, 47. Alzog, i., § 87, 130. Butler, ch. 44, 50. Cheetham, ch. 9, §4. Coxe, Lect. 3, § 23. Crooks, ch. 28. Darras, i.–ii. Döllinger, ii., ch. 5. Duff, 63, 108, 249, 341, 557, 605. Fisher, 105-108, 157–160. Fitzgerald, i., 235–264; ii., 1–28. Foulkes, 105, 328, 348, 368, 382. Gieseler, i., § 68, 69, 91–94. Gil-

martin, i., ch. 21. Gregorovius, i. Hase, § 128–130. Hurst, i., 325 *ff*. Kurtz, i., 264–274. Mahan, bk. 3, ch. 4. Milman, bk. 1, 2. Milner, ii., cent. 4, ch. 17; cent. 6, ch. 5–8. Moeller, i., 340–355. Neander i., § 2; ii., § 2. Robertson, bk. 2, ch. 6, p. 303. Schaff, pd. 2, ch. 4, § 50–53; pd. 3, ch. 3, §26; ch. 5, §60–64; pd. 4, ch. 4.

CHAPTER XI

MONASTICISM

OUTLINE: I.—Importance of the institution of monasticism. II.—Antecedents and analogies. III.—Causes of the origin of Christian monasticism. IV.—Evolution of Christian monasticism. V.—Spread of group monasticism from the East to the West. VI.—Development of monasticism in Western Europe. VII.—Opposition to monasticism. VIII.—Result and influences of monasticism. IX.—Sources.

MONASTICISM, the story of which is one of the strangest problems in Church history and is enshrouded in legend, originated outside the Church, but soon became the dominant factor in the Church. It was not the product of Christianity so much as an inheritance—an adopted child. It supported the orthodox faith,[1] upheld the papal theory, monopolised ecclesiastical offices, helped to mould the Church constitution, and supplied the great standing army of the Popes. It was a determining factor in European civilisation. The monk was the ideal man of the Middle Ages. He stood for the highest morality and best culture of that period. As a missionary he planted the Church over Western Europe. He stood between the laity and the hierarchy, as the friend of the former and the champion of the latter. He created the system of public charity and had a marked influence on industry and agriculture. Before

[1] Jerome, *Ep.*, 15.

long a monk sat in the chair of St. Peter and sought to rule the Church. The first series of great ecclesiastical reforms was produced by the hermits in the fourth century, the Benedictines in the sixth, the Clugniacs in the eleventh, and the Begging Orders in the thirteenth. Monasticism, therefore, was a very important institution in the rise of the Church.

Monasticism originated in antiquity and was based on a general principle broader than any creed. It grew out of that mystical longing for an uninterrupted inner enjoyment of the soul—out of a passion for self-brooding, and out of an abnormal view of the seclusion necessary for the cultivation of the true religious life, which would save the soul from sin. It was simply an effort to explain the riddle of existence and to comprehend the true relations of God, man, and the world. Every great religion has expressed itself in some form of monasticism. Centuries before Jesus there were monks and crowded convents among the Hindoos. The sacred writings of the ancient Hindoos (2400 B.C.) reveal many legends about holy hermits, and give ascetic rules.[1] Buddha, who founded his faith possibly six centuries B.C., enjoined celibacy on his priests.[2] Alexander the Great found monasticism flourishing in the East. In Greece the "Pagan Jesuits," the Pythagoreans, were a kind of ascetic order.[3] Plato, with his powerful appeal for the ideal life, had a marked influence upon the ascetic views of the early Christians, and Neo-Platonism became a positive force

[1] The Hindoo monks exhausted their minds in devising means of self-torture.

[2] Lea, *Sac. Celib.*, 24; *Laws of Manu*, bk. 6., st. 1–22. See Hardy, *Eastern Monasticism*, Lond., 1850.

[3] The disciples of Pythagoras were called cenobites. Montalembert, i., 215.

in Christendom during the third and fourth centuries. The priestesses of Delphic Apollo, Achaian Juno, and Scythian Diana were virgins.[1] In Judea the ancient Nazarites[2] afford an example. The Essenes seem to be the direct forerunners of Christian monasticism.[3] In addition there were conspicuous individual examples in Jewish history like that of Elisha, Elijah, Samuel, and John the Baptist.[4] In Rome the name of vestal virgin was a proverb. In Egypt, the priests of Serapis were ascetics,[5] the priestesses of Ceres were separated from their husbands,[6] and the Therapeutæ were rigid monks who lived about the time of Jesus.[7]

These influences and examples, coupled with Platonic philosophy, and the interpretation put upon the teachings and lives of Jesus and His Apostles, produced Christian monasticism. Jesus Himself was unmarried, poor, and had not "where to lay his head." He commanded the rich young man to sell his property for the poor,[8] and said: "Take no thought for the morrow what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed." St. John and probably other Apostles were celibates.[9] The

[1] Lea, *Sac. Celib.*, 24.

[2] Numb. vi., 1–21.

[3] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, v., 15; Porphyry, *De Abstinentia*, iv., 11; Edersheim, ch. 3; Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, ii., 330. See p. 44, 45.

[4] Isa. xxii., 2; Dan. ix., 3; Zech. xiii., 4; 2 Kings i., 8; iv., 10, 39, 42. *Cf.* Heb. xi., 37, 38; *Expositor*, 1893, i., 339.

[5] Schaff, ii., 390.

[6] Lea, *Sac. Celib.*, 24.

[7] Eusebius, ii., 17; Philo, *Contemp. Life*, bk. 1; *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, viii., 155; *Baptist Rev.*, Jan., 1882, p. 36 *ff.*; see *Jewish Encyc.*; Döllinger, ii., 335.

[8] Matt. xix., 21; Luke xviii., 22; Mark x., 21.

[9] Tertullian held that all the Apostles except Peter were unmarried.

Apostles likewise taught that following Jesus meant "forsaking father, mother, brethren, wife, children, houses and lands."[1] They urged Christians to crucify the flesh, and disparaged marriage,[2] and they too were poor and homeless like their Master.[3]

The supreme question asked by earnest Christians in all ages has been this: "What is the true, the ideal Christian life?"[4] At every step of her progress the Church has given a different answer to the important query. Yet in all this divergent opinion there is plainly seen one common conviction. To live in the service of God, in the religious denunciation of the world, and in the abnegation of the joys of life—that is the universal reply. In the early Church this position was very strongly emphasised and led, in consequence, to the rise of monasticism. Hence it may be said that the monastic ideals simply expressed the highest ideals of the Church, and the history of monasticism becomes a vital part of the history of the mediæval Church.

It must be remembered, too, that the old belief that the Church was poor, pure, and wholly spiritual until the time of Constantine is a false tradition. The secularisation and materialisation of the Church was so noticeable as to cause complaint as early as the third century. The Church Fathers unanimously deplore the precocious decay of the Christian world.[5] To the minds of many, therefore, the only way to escape

[1] Mark x., 29, 30.

[2] Paul, especially 1 Cor. vii.; Lea, *Sac. Celib.*, 25.

[3] Texts quoted as favourable to monasticism: Acts ii., 44; iv., 32; xv., 28, 29; 1 Cor. vii., 8; iv., 3; Matt. xix., 12, 21; xxii., 30; Rev. xiv., 4; Luke xx., 35; Mark x., 29, 30.

[4] Harnack, *Monasticism*, 10.

[5] Montalembert, i., bk. 1.

the damning effects of contamination with the Roman world, the only way to elude the evils in the Church itself, and the only sure way of leading the ideal Christian life was to flee from villages and cities to the mountains and deserts. "They fled not only from the world, but from the world within the Church." When Christianity was drawn from the catacombs to the court of the Cæsars, it lost its power to regenerate souls. That memorable alliance hindered neither the ruin of the Empire, nor "the servitude and mutilation of the Church."[1] Associated with the power that so long sought to destroy her, the Church was brought face to face with the tremendous task of transforming and replacing the Empire. At the same time the Church made a desperate attempt, though in vain, to keep alive the spiritual torches of apostolic Christianity. The solution of that great problem, however, was left to the monks.

The philosophy which prevailed among many of the early Christians held that the material world is all evil, and that the spiritual world is the only good. Gnosticism, which permeated Christendom in the second century, declared that the body is the seat of evil and hence that it must be abused in order to purify the soul within.[2] Montanism advocated an excessive puritanism, and prescribed numerous fasts and severities, which paved the way for asceticism. Other groups of Christian philosophers exercised similar influences.[3] The Church itself commended fasting and other practices for the cultivation of

[1] Montalembert, i., 188.

[2] Lightfoot, *The Colossian Heresy*.

[3] Marcionites, Valentinians, Abstinents, Apotoctici, Encratites, etc.

spiritual benefit. Celibacy of the clergy gradually became the rule. As a result the belief soon developed that the surest way to gain eternal joys in heaven was to turn away from the transitory pleasures of earth. Christianity in the first and second centuries was the gospel of renunciation and resurrection. The next logical step was to make the body as miserable as possible here—sort of a pious sacrifice—in order to make the soul happier hereafter. To die that one might really live, to find one's life in losing it—that became the supreme purpose of earthly existence. The most eminent of the early Fathers commended asceticism, particularly fasting and celibacy, and many likewise practised it. It is easy to feel that the air was charged with ascetic ideals. The literature, the philosophy, and the religion of the day all pointed out narrow paths that led to holiness. As a result there were many ascetics of both sexes, although they were bound by no irrevocable vow.[1]

The persecutions of Christians by the Roman government forced many to flee for safety to the deserts and mountains.[2] Thus Paul of Thebes and St. Anthony fled in the Decian persecutions about the year 250. When persecution ceased, martyrdom had become such a holy act, and such a short, easy road to a sainted, eternal life, that the most devout resolved that since they could not die as martyrs, they would at least live as martyrs. The mildness of the climate in Egypt and Palestine, where the small amount of food and clothing needed for subsistence was easily procured, made those regions the birthplace of monasticism. The growth of worldliness in the Church,

[1] Cyprian, *Ep.*, 62.
[2] Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.*, vi., 42.

with the increase of numbers and wealth, gave rise to many cries for reform. The legalisation and, along with it, the paganisation of the Church gave birth to much that was bitterly denounced. The union of the Church and state was the climax—the Church was no longer the "bride of Christ," it was held, but the mistress of a worldly ruler. Hence monasticism turned its back not only on the world but also on the Church. To understand it, therefore, it must be viewed as the first great reformation in the Church—a desire to return to simple, pure, spiritual, apostolic Christianity.[1]

Christian monasticism did not begin at any fixed time or place. It was slowly evolved as a curious mixture of heathen, Jewish, and Christian influences. The whole Church had an ascetic aspect during the apostolic age, hence endurance, hardihood, and constant self-denial were required of its members. But for one hundred and fifty years no proofs of a distinct class of ascetics can be found within the Church, except, perhaps, the order of widows, devoted to charity, supported by gifts from the faithful, and sanctioned by the Apostles.[2] In the second century, however, a class of orthodox Christians, who desired to attain Christian perfection, were called "abstinents" or "ascetics." They withdrew from society but not from the Church, renounced marriage and property, fasted and prayed, and eagerly sought a martyr's death.[3] The belief that the end of the world was near no doubt

[1] Harnack, *Monasticism*, 65.

[2] 1 Tim. v., 3–14. *Cf.* Acts ix., 39, 41.

[3] Justin Martyr observed that Christians were commencing to abstain from flesh, wine, and sexual intercourse. He, with Ignatius and others, lauds celibacy as the holiest state.

did much to emphasise the necessity of preparing for the day of judgment. By the third century the Christian literature, philosophy, and theology were tinged with asceticism. Cyprian, Origen, Hieracus, Methodius, Tertullian, and others taught the efficacy of asceticism in one form or another and, to some extent, practised it themselves,[1] but always within the Church. The heretical sects became still more prominent in their reverence for austerities and even outdid the orthodox in practice.[2] This first stage of asceticism was neither organised, nor absolutely cut off from the Church.

The product of this wide-spread ascetic agitation was the creation of a new type, namely, anchoretism, or hermit life, about the middle of the third century. This was the second phase of monastic evolution. It appeared first in Egypt about the fourth century, where the physical conditions were most suitable, in the home of the Therapeutæ and Serapis monks, the stronghold of heresy and paganism, the birthplace of Neo-Platonism amid a people famous for fanaticism. The Decian persecution in 250 was, apparently, the immediate occasion for its birth. Anthony of Alexandria, and Ammon were the earliest representatives of this new form of asceticism. Paul of Thebes, however, is now generally believed to be a pious romance from the pen of Jerome, but he may still be viewed as typical.

Anthony (251–356), the "patriarch of the monks," was the real founder of anchoretism. He early sold his estate for the poor, gave his sister to a body of

[1] Celibacy was habitually practised by some; others devoted their lives to the poor. Many converts like Cyprian sold their possessions for the needy. Still others like Origen mutilated themselves.

[2] Irenæus, *Against Heresy*, i., 24; Epiphanius, *Heresy*, 23.

virgins, and cut himself off from the world by retiring to a desert in order to devote his life to spiritual things. He lived as a strict hermit till a great age, gained a world-wide fame, had many visitors seeking spiritual guidance, and won many converts to monasticism. Soon the wildest tales were told about his divine powers. Before he died Egypt was full of hermits, and some were found in Palestine. Athanasius wrote his biography, which was read over all Christendom and scattered seeds of anchoretism everywhere—a book which influenced the thought of the age. Ammon had a settlement of possibly 5000 hermits at Mount Nitria in Lower Egypt and was almost as renowned as Anthony, his great contemporary.[1]

The example of these illustrious characters drew thousands of both the curious and the sincere to Egypt.[2] Whole congregations, led by their bishops, withdrew to the desert for salvation.[3] Priests fled from the obligations of their office.[4] By the fourth century that land was full of hermits. Their life was of a negative character, founded on abstinence and bodily abuse —a holy rivalry of self-torture and suicidal austerities. These practices may be divided into four classes: dietetic, sexual, social, and spiritual.

(1) From a dietetic standpoint the hermits either fasted, or ate the simplest foods, or consumed the smallest quantities. Thus the renowned Isidore of Alexandria never ate meat, and often at the table would burst into tears for shame at the thought that he who

[1] Rufinus, *Concerning Ascetic Life*, 30; Socrates, iv., 23; Sozomen, i., 14. See Montalembert, i., 227.

[2] Augustine, *Confessions*, viii., 15.

[3] Harnack, *Monasticism*, 27.

[4] *Ibid.*, 47.

was destined to eat angel's food in Paradise should have to eat the material food of animals. Macarius ate but once a week. His son lived three years on five ounces of bread a day and seven years on raw vegetables. Alos boasted that up to his eighteenth year he never ate bread. Symeon ate but once daily and in fast time not at all. Heliodorus often fasted seven days at a time. In Mesopotamia a group of hermits lived on grass.[1]

(2) Sexually the hermits believed either in absolute virginity or in abstinence.

(3) The social and domestic vagaries of anchoretism assumed many forms. The hermits fled from the society of the world; deserted friends and family; courted the company of wild beasts[2]; lived in caves, dried-up wells, swamps, rude huts, tombs, and on the summits of solitary columns, or wandered about without fixed homes.[3] A monk named Akepsismas lived sixty years in the same cell without seeing or speaking to any person and was finally shot for a wolf. Some hermits wore no clothing,[4] and thus exposed the body to the broiling sun and to biting insects. Macarius, to atone for killing a gnat, lay naked six months in a swamp and was so badly stung that he was mistaken for a leper.[5] Others wore hair shirts, carried heavy weights suspended from the body, slept in thorn bushes, against a pillar, in cramped quarters, or deprived themselves altogether of sleep. Many never washed their faces nor cared for their hair, beards, teeth, and nails. With them filthiness seemed to be next to godliness.

[1] Sozomen, vi., 33; Tillemont, *Mem.*, viii., 292.

[2] Severus, *Dialogues*, i., 8.

[3] Evagrius, *Ch. Hist*, i., 13, 21; ii., 9; vi., 22; Theodosius, *Philoth.*, 12, 26; Nilus, *Letters*, ii., 114, 115; Gregory of Tours, viii., 16.

[4] Augustine, *City of God*, i., xiv., ch. 51.

[5] Tillemont, *Mem.*, viii., 633.

Anthony and Hilarion scorned either to cut or to comb their hair except at Easter, or to wash their hands and faces. St. Abraham never washed his face for fifty years—yet his biographer proudly says, "His face reflected the purity of his soul." Theodosius, like a second Moses, had a stream of water burst from a rock that his thirsty monks might drink. One wicked fellow, overcome by a pitiable weakness for cleanliness, took a bath, when, lo! the stream dried up. Thereupon the frightened and repentant monks promised never to insult heaven by using water for that purpose again, and after a year of waiting a second miracle gave them a fresh supply.

(4) A sincere desire for spiritual improvement expressed itself in various practices. Prayer was perhaps the most common means to that end, and it was believed that number and duration counted the most. Paul the Simple repeated three hundred prayers a day and counted them with pebbles. A certain famous virgin added four hundred to that number daily. Some spent all day and others all night in prayer. Meditation and contemplation were generally employed. Preaching and singing were common forms of religious activity. Studying and writing engaged those of a more scholarly bent of mind.

Out of this unorganised anchoretism there grew, by the latter part of the third century, a crude form of group monasticism. This was the third stage in the progress of monastic life. Such renowned hermits as St. Anthony in Upper Egypt, Ammon at Mount Nitria, Joannes in Thebaid, Macarius in the Scetische Desert, and Hilarion in the Gaza Desert each had a coterie of imitators imbued with a common purpose and with a profound respect for their leader; but no

uniform rules governed them at first. As time passed, however, the necessity of regulating the various relations of so many became apparent.[1] The organisations of the Essenes and Therapeutæ may have served as models. At Mount Nitria the monks by common arrangement lived in separate cells, but had a dining room and a chapel for all.[2] Pachomius (282–346), a converted heathen soldier, of little education, a pupil of Palæmon for twelve years, created the first monastic rule and organised at Tabenna on the Nile the first monastic congregation (322), while his sister formed the first convent at Tabenisi. This first walled monastery had many cells built to accommodate three monks in each. Membership was guarded by three years' probation on severe discipline. The monks met in silence for one daily meal and wore white hoods so as not to see each other. They prayed thirty-six times daily, worked with their hands indoors and out, and wore over their linen underclothes white goat skins day and night. They were ruled by "priors" chosen on merit from the twenty-four classes of monks.[3] At the head of the whole system stood an abbot.[4] When Pachomius died (346) he had established nine cloisters with 3000 monks. He called them all together twice a year, and paid them annual visits. By 400 the monks numbered 50,000.[5] The great Athanasius visited Tabenna to inspect the system and to study the operation of this epoch-making rule.

[1] The rule of St. Oriesis is little more than a mystical praise of asceticism.

[2] Socrates, iv., 23; Sozomen, i., 14.

[3] Gwatkin, *Arianism*.

[4] Sozomen, iii., 14.

[5] Hergenröther, 452.

From Tabenna organised monasticism spread over Egypt and then to nearly every province in the Roman Empire by the end of the fourth century.[1] In the Holy Land laboured Hilarion,[2] Epiphanius,[3] Hesycas,[4] the Bethlehem brothers,[5] Ammonius,[6] Silvanus, and Zacharias. Jerome, the celebrated Church Father, with Paula, a rich Roman widow, left Rome for the East. After studying monasticism in Egypt they located at Bethlehem (386). There Jerome studied the Scriptures and ruled a large crowd of monks, while Paula became the head of a convent for girls. Melania built a convent on the Mount of Olives and ruled fifty virgins (375). Goddana and Elias laboured on the lower Jordan.

In Asia Minor laboured, conspicuous among many, Eustathius who first prescribed a monastic dress, Basil the Great (c. 379) who originated the monastic vow,[7] the famous Nilus (c. 430), and the hated hermit Marcus (c. 431). Syria was renowned for at least a dozen hermits, the most celebrated being Simeon Stylites (c. 459),[8] the pillar saint. From Egypt and Asia the institution spread to Greece and became quite general by the fourth century. The most famous cloister was that of Studium (460) at Constantinople. The islands of the Adriatic and Tuscan Sea were soon covered with monasteries swarming with monks.[9]

[1] Theod., *Hist. Rel.*, 30; Augustine, *De Mor. Eccl.*, i., 31.
[2] Sozomen, iii., 14; vi., 32.
[3] A follower of Hilarion. Made bishop of Cyprus in 367.
[4] Sozomen, vi., 32.
[5] *Ibid.*, vi., 32.
[6] Eusebius, viii., 13; Socrates, iv., 36; Sozomen, vi., 38.
[7] Sozomen, vi., 32.
[8] Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, ch. 26.
[9] Smith, *Rise of Christ. Monast.*, 48.

The fourth and most important step is found in the development of the institution in western Europe.

Athanasius, a hero and oracle to the Western Church, on a tour to Rome in 340, carried with him from Egypt two specimens of hermits.[1] His *Life of Anthony* was soon translated into Latin. The West had already heard about the institution, and many individuals had visited the most celebrated hermits in Egypt. After 340 many men and women began to give enthusiastic support to the new institution. Eusebius (c. 370) lived by rule with his clergy under one roof at Vercelli in northern Italy.[2] Ambrose fostered it in and around Milan.[3] Paul of Nola (c. 431) lived in Campagna. Conspicuous examples were found among the Roman virgins and widows.[4] Marcella in Rome turned her palace into a convent.[5] Paula and her whole family lived as ascetics. The widow Lea was an active worker.[6] Melania devoted her fortune to the cause. Many of the nobles of Rome likewise became converts to the new idea.[7] Jerome and Rufinus were conspicuous examples of those devotees who by precept and practice soon popularised monasticism throughout Italy. Convents for both sexes were soon founded.[8] From Rome Augustine carried the institution back to north-western Africa. When Cassian (c. 448) left Egypt and planted two monasteries at Marseilles, he

[1] Augustine, *De Mor. Eccl.*, p. 33. He had been in Gaul in 337 and 338.
[2] Ambrose, *Letters*, 63, 66.
[3] Augustine, *Confessions*, viii., 15.
[4] Montalembert, i., 291–300.
[5] Jerome, *Letter* 127.
[6] Jerome, *Letter* 23.
[7] Montalembert, i., 291; Jerome, *Letter* 26.
[8] Jerome, *Letter* 96.

found monks already in France. Martin, the Bishop of Tours, turned his episcopal palace into a monastery, and at his death (400) 2000 monks followed him to the grave.[1] Poitiers, Lyons, and Treves, together with the bordering mountains, were soon scenes of monastic activity. Donatus, an African monk, early carried the new faith to Spain where it soon became so popular that by 380 a synod forbade priests dressing as monks. Athanasius, who lived at Treves as an exile, probably introduced it into Germany. The British Isles had a flourishing system long before the mission of Augustine. By the fifth century, therefore, monasticism had been firmly planted over all western Europe.[2]

Although western monasticism was an offspring of the eastern type, yet the child differed much from the parent. Anchoretism gained but little foothold in the West because of climatic and ethnic differences. The group type was dominant in the West, and extremes and excesses were absent. No pillar saints and other conspicuous fanatics were found there.[3] Western monasticism was a more practical system, an economic factor, a powerful missionary machine, an educational agency, and the pioneer of civilisation. It was not a negative force, but very aggressive and made history. It led all the great reform movements. It was uniform in spirit, though widely divergent in form. In some cases monks were under abbots each with his own rule; others had no fixed abode—and many of them were tramps of the worst description, living on their

[1] Sulpic, Severus, *Life of St. Martin.*

[2] See Ozanam, *Hist. of Civ. in the 5th Cent.*

[3] Mosheim, bk. ii., cent. 5, part 2, ch. 3, §12, tells of a German fanatic who built a pillar near Treves and attempted to imitate the career of Simeon Stylites, but the neighbouring bishops pulled it down.

holy calling.[1] Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and many other Fathers have left sufficient complaints about the growing monastic disorders. The need of a common rule, therefore, was generally felt in order to unify the highly varied, and in part highly doubtful forms of monasticism.

Early efforts were made to meet that need. Jerome translated the rule of Pachomius into Latin and it was used in parts of Italy. Rufinus brought the rule of Basil the Great to Rome and it was adopted in southern Italy and in Gaul. The rule of Macarius was at least known in the West. Cassian (c. 448) was the first, however, to write out for the cruder western institution a detailed constitution (c. 429). He had studied monasticism in Egypt and drew up a very complete rule which covered all the essential phases of cloister life. It was used in many cloisters till the ninth century. During this early unorganised period Popes, councils, and even secular powers often tried to control and regulate monasticism.

The great organiser and unifier of western monasticism, however, was St. Benedict (d. 543), "the patriarch of the monks of the west."[2] Born of rich parents at Nursia in 480, he was sent to Rome to complete his education. There he became disgusted with the vice about him, fled from college, family, and fortune, and at the age of sixteen, retired to a cave at Subiaco thirty miles from Rome. He became a severe ascetic, wore a hair shirt and a monk's dress of skins, rolled in beds of thistles to subdue the flesh, and chose to be ignorant and holy rather than educated and wicked. His fame soon attracted disciples and he established

[1] Cassian, *Inst.*, ii., 2; St. Benedict, *Rule*, ch. 1; Jerome, *Ep.*, 95.
[2] Gregory I., *Dialogues*, bk. ii. See Montalembert, i., bk. 4.

twelve monasteries, with a dozen monks and a superior in each, but all under his own supervision. Later he left Subiaco and went to Monte Cassino where he spent the closing years of his remarkable career. Monte Cassino became the capital of western monasticism.

To control his monks Benedict drew up in 529 the "Holy Rule," [1] which became the basis for all western monastic orders and was a rival of St. Basil's rule in the East. The "Holy Rule" was the product of Benedict's own sad experience as hermit, cenobite, and superior, and also of his observations concerning the monastic laxness which he saw on all hands. It consists of a prologue and chapters on seventy-three governmental, social, moral, liturgical, and penal subjects. The whole spirit and aim of the Rule were constructive and reformatory. It provided for an organisation monarchial at the top and democratic at the bottom. Each monastery had an abbot elected for life by all the monks to rule the monastery in the place of Christ. The abbot chose the prior and deans, on the basis of merit, with the approval of the monks, but minor officials were named directly by the abbot. The important business affairs of the monastery were conducted by the abbot in consultation with all the monks, but minor matters required only the advice of the superior officers. Admission was open to all ranks and classes of men above eighteen on an equal footing after one year's probation. The two fundamental principles in this constitution were labour and obedience. Indolence was branded as the enemy of the soul.

[1] Henderson, 274; *Rule of our most Holy Father Benedict*, Lond., 1886; Ogg, *Source Book*, § 11.

Each candidate had to take the vow of obedience and constancy to the order; chastity and poverty of course being implied. A monk's day was minutely regulated, according to the seasons, and consisted of an alternation of manual work, study, and worship, with short intervals for food and rest. Labour was thus regulated in the monastery somewhat as in an industrial penitentiary. The frugal meal was eaten in silence while some edifying selection was read. The monks had to renounce the world and give all the fruits of their labours to the monastery.

Obedience was regarded as the most meritorious and essential condition of all. Monasticism meant a generous sacrifice of self and implied a surrender of the will to a superior. The monk must obey not only the abbot but also the requests of his brethren. Monks were treated as children grown up. They could not own property—not even the smallest trifles; they were not allowed to walk abroad at will; if sent away, they could not eat without the abbot's permission; they could not receive letters from home; and they were sent to bed early. Once in the order the vow of stability prevented withdrawal. A violation of any of the regulations entailed punishment: private admonition, exclusion from common prayer, whipping, and expulsion.

This Rule, all things considered, was mild, flexible, and general; with order, proportion, and regularity, yet brief, concise, and well tempered to the needs of western Europe[1]; hence like Aaron's rod it soon swallowed up the other rules in use. Before 600 it was supreme in Italy. In 788 the Council of Aachen ordered it and no other to be used throughout the kingdom of Charles

[1] Doyle, *The Teaching of St. Benedict*, Lond., 1887.

the Great. In the ninth century it superseded the Isidore rule in Spain. It embraced likewise the Columban rule in western Europe and by the tenth century prevailed everywhere. Under it the Benedictines had a remarkable history. At one time they had 37,000 monasteries and altogether produced 24 Popes, 200 cardinals, 4000 bishops, and 55,505 saints.[1] The Benedictine monasteries differed from later monastic bodies in the fact that they were quite independent of each other and had no common head. After the thirteenth century they were surpassed by the Begging Orders and devoted themselves mostly to literary pursuits, soon becoming "more noted for learning than piety." Their edition of the Church Fathers is a monument of scholarly industry.[2] The order still exists, chiefly in Austria and Italy, and is noted mostly for its classical learning. They boast of 16,000 distinguished writers.

These early monasteries were like swarming bees in planting monastic societies in every part of western Europe. The passion grew until it became a veritable madness which seized the pious and lawless alike. Popes like Gregory I. praised the institution and promoted its interest in every possible way. Even kings like Carloman of the Franks, Rochis of the Lombards, great statesmen like Cassiodorus, and others voluntarily became monks. Louis the Pious, the Roman Emperor, was prevented from that course only by his nobles.[3] The monk was the leader and pattern of the Middle

[1] Lea, *Sac. Cel.*, 116. See *Cath. Encyc.*

[2] Stephen, *Essays in Eccl. Biog.*, 240.

[3] It was boasted that no less than twenty Emperors and forty-seven kings cast aside their crowns to become Benedictine monks, while ten Emperors and fifty queens entered convents, but it is impossible to discover them.

Ages. Every father was ambitious to have his son enter that holy calling. To the quiet and peaceful abode of the monastery, therefore, went not only the pious, but the student, those who disliked the soldier's life, the disconsolate, the disgraced, the disappointed, the indolent, and the weary. And this powerful organisation was utterly under the control of the great Roman Bishop and his subordinates.

The remarkable growth of monasticism brought great wealth and political power, which were used in large measure to strengthen the Church. Kings and nobles made large grants of lands—especially Charles the Great and Louis the Pious. Besides many monks brought their possessions as gifts to the monastery and not infrequently powerful abbots took lands by force. Monasticism thus gradually became secularised and also feudalised. Monasteries were often used as prisons for deposed kings, criminals, and clergy convicted of crime. The abbots were virtually secular lords who ruled as local sovereigns, claimed immunity from tolls and taxes, went hunting and hawking, and even fought at the head of their troops. As a result the office of abbot became a coveted prize, for the younger and the illegitimate sons of nobles.[1] What effect this secularisation had upon the high ideals may be easily seen. Soon only certain ceremonies distinguished the monks from the secular clergy.

The monks as such belong to the laity. Monasticism was viewed as a lay institution as late as the Council of Chalcedon (451)[2] when the legal authority of the bishop over the monks of his diocese was recognised. The monks were called *religiosi* in contrast to the

[1] Milman, iii., 88.
[2] Schaff, iii., 173.

seculares, the priests. The monks were the "regulars" who formed the spiritual nobility and not the ruling class in the hierarchy. They formed another grade in the hierarchy between the clergy and the laity. But after the fifth century the difference became less marked. Since monasticism was considered the perfection of Christian life, it was natural to choose the clergy from the monks. Gregory the Great was the first monk to be elected Pope. Monasteries were the theological seminaries to supply priests for the Church, hence the ignorant clergy looked up to the educated monks. Still monks at first, because not ordained, could not say mass nor hear confession. Each monastery kept a priest or an ordained monk to fulfil these duties. Abbots were usually in priestly orders.[1] In time, however, monks assumed the dress of priests and became ambitious for priestly powers,[2] especially after the Council of Chalcedon, backed by the state, gave bishops jurisdiction over cloisters. Often monasteries applied to the Pope for independence from episcopal jurisdiction and were taken under the immediate protection of the Bishop of Rome. By the sixth century monks were classed in the popular mind with the clergy. In 827 a council at Rome ordered that abbots should be in priests' orders. Monks now began to sit in and to control Church synods, and to exercise all the rights of the secular clergy, even to having parishes,[3] and thus became powerful rivals of the established priesthood.

The crystallisation of ascetic ideals into monastic

[1] The vast amount of legislation on this point is very indicative.

[2] Gregory, *Letter* v., 1; i., 42.

[3] This right was prohibited in the 11th and 12th centuries, but Innocent III. granted the permission in certain cases.

institutions was attacked by heathenism and did not meet the unanimous approval of Christendom. Before Constantine the pagans denounced the hermits because they were guilty of the treasonable act, from a Roman view, of fleeing from social and civic duties. After Constantine, when monasticism became the "fad," it was assailed by the aristocratic pagan families, who lost sons, and especially wives and daughters, in the maelstrom of enthusiasm, because it broke family ties and caused the neglect of obvious responsibilities. Julian, the imperial pagan reactionist, called it fanaticism and idolatry. Pagan poets like Libanus and Rutilius denounced it as an institution "hostile to light."

Within Christendom hostility came from Christian rulers like Valens, because monasticism withdrew civil and military strength from the state, when all was needed against the barbarians, and because it encouraged idleness and unproductiveness instead of useful activity and heroic virtue[1]; from Christians of wealth and indulgence who felt rebuked by the earnestness, poverty, and holy zeal of an ascetic life; from the clergy who did not comprehend the significance of monasticism[2]; and from the liberal party in the Church who took a saner view of salvation and ethics. Jovinian (d. 406), like Luther, first a monk and then a reformer, held these five points according to Jerome: (1) that virgins, widows, and wives are all on an equality if good Christians; (2) that thankfully partaking of food is as efficacious as fasting; (3) that spiritual baptism is as effectual in overcoming the devil as baptism;

[1] Cod. Theodos., xii., 1, 63.

[2] See the works of Sulpicius Severus for attacks on the monks in Gaul and Spain.

(4) that all sins are equal; (5) that all rewards and punishments will be equal. Jerome answered him and Pope Siricius excommunicated him and his followers as heretics (390).[1] Helvidius of Rome denounced the reverence for celibacy and declared that the marriage state was as holy as that of virginity. Again Jerome wielded his intellectual cudgel.[2] Bonasus, Bishop of Sardica, was excommunicated for holding the same view (389). Vigilantius, an educated Gallic slave, a disciple of Jovinian, attacked the necessity of celibacy, denied the efficacy of virginity, opposed fasting and torture, ridiculed relics, objected to candles, incense, and prayers for the dead, and doubted miracles. He was a Protestant living in the fifth century.[3] He too was assailed by Jerome and put under the papal ban.[4] Ærius of Sebasta, a presbyter, called into question the need or value of fasts, prayers for the dead, the inequality of rank among the clergy, and the celebration of Easter and of course was outlawed by the Church.[5] Lactantius declared that the hermit life was that of a beast rather than a man and treasonable to society. But all these loud outcries against the monks were branded as heresy and drowned in countershouts of praise.

When the results and influences of monasticism are carefully weighed, it is seen that the good and evil "are blended together almost inextricably." These diametrically opposite effects are perplexing and

[1] *Against Jovinian* (392).

[2] The attack is found in two works, *Against Helvidius* (383) and his *Apology*.

[3] Gilly, *Vigilantius and His Times*, Lond., 1844. See Jerome's writings.

[4] *Against Vigilantius* (406).

[5] Epiphanius, *Heresies*, 75.

astonishing. Conspicuous among the positive results are the following:

1. *Religious.* The effort to save pure Christianity from the secularised state-Church by carrying it to the desert or shutting it up in a monastery, produced the first great reform movement within the Christian Church. "It was always the monks who saved the Church when sinking, emancipated her when becoming enslaved to the world, defended her when assailed." [1] Monasticism was, therefore, a realisation of the ideal in Christianity. In no small sense it likewise paved the way for the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The monastic conquest of Christianity left in its train higher ideals of a holy Christian life and a keener religious enthusiasm, and emphasised the necessity of humility and purity. Likewise monasticism, through its aggressive missionary efforts, completed the overthrow of heathenism in the Empire and in its stead planted the true faith over western Europe. The monks were the fiercest champions of orthodoxy, and the intellectual giants of that age, like Jerome and St. Augustine, were in their ranks. The monk rather than the priest was the apostle of the Middle Ages who taught men and nations the simple Christian life of the Gospel. In monasticism were developed the germs of many humanitarian institutions through which Christianity expressed itself in a most practical manner. The monastery offered a home to the poor and unfortunate, and gave hope and refuge to both the religious invalid, who was sick of the world, and to the religious fanatic. The Papacy, too, was supported and strengthened in a thousand different ways by monasticism,

[1] Harnack, *Monasticism*, 65.

and the whole religious history of the Middle Ages was coloured by it.

2. *Social.* Monasticism tended to purify and regenerate society with lofty ideas. It became an unexcelled machine for the administration of charity. It fed the hungry, cared for the sick and dying, entertained the traveller, and was an asylum for all the unfortunates. It helped to mitigate the terrors of slavery. It inculcated ideas of obedience and usefulness. It advocated and practised equality and communism, and it tutored the half-civilised nations of western Europe in the arts of peace.

3. *Political.* In its organisation and practical life it kept alive ideas of democracy. From the ranks of the monks came many of the best statesmen in the various European governments. Monastic zeal had much to do in saving the Roman Empire from utter destruction at the hands of the barbarians and in helping to preserve imperial ideas until the rough Teutons were Latinised in their legal and political institutions. In addition the monks helped to form the various law codes of the German tribes, put them into written form, and took an active part in many forms of local government. In many an instance they saved the unprotected vassal from the tyrannical noble.

4. *Educational.* In the monasteries the torches of civilisation and learning were kept burning during the so-called Dark Ages. The first musicians, painters, sculptors, architects, and educators of Christian Europe were monks. They not only established the schools, and were the schoolmasters in them, but also laid the foundations for the universities. They were the thinkers and philosophers of the day and shaped the political and religious thought. To them, both col-

lectively and individually, was due the continuity of thought and civilisation of the ancient world with the later Middle Ages and with the modern period.

5. *Industrial.* Not only did the monks develop the various arts such as copying and illuminating books, building religious edifices, painting, and carving, but they also became the model farmers and horticulturists of Europe. Every Benedictine monastery was an agricultural college for the whole region in which it was located. By making manual labour an essential part of monastic life, labour was greatly ennobled above the disreputable position it held among the Romans.

The negative effects of monasticism were by no means lacking and may be stated here under the same institutional headings:

1. *Religious.* In making "war on nature" the ascetics made war also on God. They aimed not too high religiously but in the wrong direction. They exaggerated sin and advocated the wrong means to get rid of it. They took religion away from the crowded centres of population, where it was most needed, to the desert or monastery. Thus an abnormal, unwholesome type of piety was created. In replacing faith by works the monks thus gave birth to a long list of abuses in the Church, and in nourishing an insane religious fanaticism they entailed many grave evils. From one point of view monasticism became a "morbid excrescence" of Christianity and tended to degrade man into a mere religious machine. At the same time the doctrine of future rewards and punishments reached an abhorrent evolution. The awful pangs of hell, the terrific judgments of God, and the ubiquitous and wily devil of the monks' vivid imagination sound strange to a modern mind. But the gravest error in the

monastic system was the false and harmful distinction so clearly drawn both in theory and practice between the secular and the religious. The modern world easily harmonises the two.

2. *Social.* Monasticism disrupted family ties and caused the desertion of social duties on the ground of a more sacred duty. It lowered respect for the marriage state by magnifying the virtue of celibacy. In making the monk the ideal man of the Middle Ages, it advocated social suicide. All natural pleasures and enjoyments of life were labelled sinful. Practices, which were little more than superstitions, were advocated. Society in general was demoralised because monasticism failed to practise its own teachings.

3. *Political.* By inducing thousands, and many of them men of character, ability, and experience, to desert their posts of civic duty, the state was weakened and patriotism forgotten. The monk "died to the world" and abjured his country. Monasticism aided powerfully in developing the secular side of the papal hierarchy and soon came to exercise a large amount of political power itself. The monks frequently became embroiled in social disputes and military quarrels, and thus incited rather than allayed the fiercer brute passions of men.

4. *Cultural.* By holding the education of the people in their hands the monks had a powerful weapon for evil as well as good. In making the monk the ideally cultured man a false standard was set up and certain fundamentals in education ignored. Secular learning was not generally encouraged. The supreme end of all their education was not to produce a man, but a priest.

5. *Industrial.* Thousands withdrew from the vari-

ous lines of industrial activity, some to obtain the higher good, but many to enter as they supposed a life of ease and idleness. Much of the good that was done in the earlier days was negatived by the begging friars later.

Of these two sets of influences which predominated? That both were powerful no one can doubt. All things considered, however, it must be said that monasticism, as it developed in the West, fulfilled a genuine need and performed an important service for Christian civilisation. St. Benedict not only presented a satisfactory solution of the grave dangers threatening this institution as a force in the evolution of the mediæval Church, but with his organised army of devoted, obedient followers, he met the barbarian hosts invading the Roman Empire and gradually won them to adopt and in due course of time to practise the Christian code. Indeed it is difficult to imagine how the Church could have forged its course so triumphantly through all the breakers, trials, and vicissitudes of this crucial epoch—how its jurisdiction could have been extended so rapidly and so effectively to all parts of western Europe and to some points in the East and in northern Africa—how its great humanising, spiritualising, and edifying influences could have been so persistent and at the same time so efficient—how the simple, fundamental truths of the Gospel as set forth in the Apostolic Church could have been handed on to the later ages—had not the growth of monasticism been regulated and utilised. Therefore, next to the evolution of that magnificent organisation of the Papacy, as a creative factor in the rise of the mediæval Church, must be placed organised, western monasticism.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

I.—JEWISH:

1.—*Old Testament.*

2.—Josephus, *Antiquities*, i., bk. 15, ch. 10, sec. 4–5; bk. 18, ch. 1, sec. 5; ii., bk. 2, ch. 8, sec. 2–11.

3.—Philo, *Contemplative Life.* Bohn, *Eccl. Lib.*, 1855, iv., 1–21.

II.—GREEK:

1.—*New Testament.*

2.—*New Testament Apocrypha.*

3.—Eusebius, *Church Hist.*, ii., ch. 17. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, i. Several other eds.

4.—Socrates, *Church Hist.*, i., 13; iv., 23 *ff. Ib.*, ii. Other eds.

5.—Sozomen, *Church Hist.*, i., 12–14; iii., 14; vi., 28–34. *Ib.*, ii.

6.—Theodoret, *Church Hist.*, ch. 33. *Ib.*, iii. Bohn Lib.

7.—Evagrius, *Life of St. Anthony.* Bohn Lib., 1851.

8.—Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca.* Ed. by Butler, *Texts and Studies.* Camb., 1898.

9.—*Concerning the Ascetic Life.* Not in Eng.

III.—LATIN:

1.—Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogues*, i.–iii. *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xi., pt. 11.

2.—Athanasius, *Life of Anthony. Ib.*, iv., 195–221.

3.—Ambrose, *Concerning Virgins. Ib.*, x., 360. *Letters*, No. 63. *Ib.*, 457.

4.—Augustine, *The Work of Monks. Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church*, xxii., 470–516.

5.—Cassian, *Institutes. Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xi. *Cœnobia, Ib. Conferences, Ib.*

6.—Jerome, *Life of St. Paul the First Hermit. Ib.*, vi., 299–318; *Letters*, No. 22, 130. *Ib.*

7.—Gregory the Great, *Letters. Ib.*, xii.; *Life and Miracles of St. Benedict.* Ed. by Luck, Lond., 1880.

8.—Rufinus, *History of Monks.* Not in Eng.

9.—Cassiodorus, *Dissertation on Monasticism.* Not in Eng. *Letters.* Ed. by Hodgkin, Oxf., 1886.

IV.—COLLECTIONS:

1.—*Apostolic Canons.* See Ch. IX. of this work.
2.—*Apostolic Constitutions. Ib.*
3.—Henderson, *Select Histor. Docs. of the M. A.*, 274–314.
4.—Univ. of Neb., *Europ. Hist. Studies*, ii., No. 6.
5.—Univ. of Pa., *Translations and Reprints*, ii., No. 7.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Allies, T. W., *The Monastic Life from the Fathers of the Desert to Charlemagne.* Lond., 1896.
2.—Browne, E. G. K., *Monastic Legends.* Lond.
3.—Butler, A., *Lives of the Saints.* Lond., 1833, 2 vols. Balt., 1844, 4 vols.
4.—Day, S. P., *Monastic Institutions.* Lond. 1865.
5.—Dill, S., *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire.* N. Y., 1904.
6.—Fosbroke, T. D., *British Monachism.* 3d. ed. Lond., 1843.
7.—Fox, S., *Monks and Monasticism* (Eng.). Lond., 1848.
8.—Hardy, H. S., *Eastern Monachism.* Lond., 1864.
9.—Harnack, A., *Monasticism: Its Ideals and Its History.* 1886. Tr. by Gillett, N. Y. Lond., 1895.
10.—Hill, O. T., *English Monasticism.* Lond., 1867.
11.—Jameson, Mrs. A., *Legends of the Monastic Orders.* Lond., 1850. Rev. ed. Bost., 1896.
12.—Kingsley, C., *The Hermits: Their Lives and Works.* Lond., 1885.
13.—Lea, H. C., *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.* Phil., 1884. 3d ed. N. Y., 1907. 2 vols.
14.—Lechner, D. P., *Life and Times of St. Benedict.* Lond.
15.—Littledale, R. F., *Monachism.* Encyc. Brit.

16.—Montalembert, Count de, *Monks of the West.* New ed. Lond., 1896. 7 vols.
17.—Northcote, J. S., *Celebrated Sanctuaries of the Madonna.* Lond., 1868.
18.—Ruffner, H., *Fathers of the Desert.* N. Y., 1850. 2 vols.
19.—Smith, I. G., *Christian Monasticism* (4th–9th cent.). Lond., 1892.
20.—Wishart, A. D., *Short History of Monks and Monasticism.* Lond., 1900.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, *Civ. of M. A.* Adeney, ch. 13. Alzog, ii., 114–121. Butler, *Ch. Hist.*, ch. 34–35. Brown, *Stoics and Saints*, ch. 5–6. Cheetham, ch. 12, sec. 3–4. Church, *Begin. of M. A.*, 48, 58. Clarke, *Events and Epochs*, ch. 3–4. Coxe, Lect. 3, sec. 3. Cunningham, *West. Civ.*, ii., 37–40. Darras, i., 636; ii., 34, 35, 121, 387; iii., 43. Döllinger, ii., ch. 5, sec. 9; iii., ch. 4, sec. 6. Draper, *Intel. Develop. of Europe.* Fisher, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 175, 234. Fitzgerald, i., 215–227. Foulkes, 88, 93, 150–151, 221, 243, 349. Gibbon, ch. 37. Gieseler, ii., ch. 4, sec. 95–97. Gilmartin, i., ch. 9, 22, 45. Hase, sec. 132–136. Hurst, i., ch. 30–31. Jennings, i., ch. 6. Kurtz, i., 248–258, 503–509. Lecky, *Hist. of Europ. Morals*, ii., ch. 4. Mahan, bk. 4, ch. 12. Maitland, *Dark Ages.* Milman, i., bk. 1, ch. 2; bk. 3, ch. 1; ii., bk. 3, ch. 6. Milner, i., cent. 4, ch. 5. Moeller, i., 355–377. Mosheim, bk. ii., cent. iv., ch. 3, § 13. Neander, ii., 262. Newman, i., 451. Putnam, *Books and their Makers*, i. Robertson, bk. 2, ch. 6, sec. 4. Schaff, iii., 147. Zenos, 104, 154, 171.

CHAPTER XII

SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH OVER EUROPE

OUTLINE: I.—Extent of Christianity under Gregory the Great. II.—Character of missionary work from the sixth to the tenth century. III.—Conversion of the British Isles. IV.—Conversion of the Franks. V.—Conversion of the Germans. VI.—Conversion of Scandinavia. VII.—Planting of the Church among the Slavs. VIII.—Efforts to convert the Mohammedans. IX.—Sources.

FROM the outset the Christian Church was imbued with a most intense and burning general missionary zeal. The command came in very distinct terms from the Master himself.[1] But there was no recognised principle of propagandism and no special organisations to carry on the work. Each Christian felt the individual obligation to win his fellows to the new faith. Separate churches no doubt naturally felt the necessity of some corporate action to convert the heathen in the neighbourhood. Prayers, indeed, for the conversion of the heathen were early made an integral part of the liturgies of the Church, East and West.[2] The actual diffusion of Christianity, however, proceeded in a special sense from the evangelical labours of the individual bishops[3]

[1] Matt. xxviii., 19, 20.

[2] Ignatius, *Letter to the Ephesians*, ch. 10. See Smith and Cheetham, art. on "The Heathen."

[3] An illustration of what must have been a common practice is found in the case of Eusebius, the Bishop of Vercelli, who made his cathedral church the centre of a wide missionary field.

and the clergy. In fact missionary work was regarded as one of their specific duties handed down from the Apostles. With the development of the organisation of the Church and the appearance of patriarchs arose the thought that it was the duty of these powerful centres to carry on missionary activity in foreign fields. Monasticism was early utilised for this important work. It must never be forgotten that the aggressive evangelising efforts of the early Church were mainly those of the West, and here is seen another powerful factor in the rise of the mediæval Church.

The conception early developed in the Church that the spread of God's Kingdom on earth was a warfare. That idea was founded on the words of Jesus,[1] on the assertions of the Apostles, and on the sacrifices of the early martyrs. Monasticism made this conviction peculiarly personal. The organised Church asserted it on every occasion. The conversion of the barbarians was viewed, in a broad sense, as an invasion and a conquest. It was a campaign with all western Europe as its field. In time it covered six centuries or more. The generals, the able strategists, were the competent and zealous Roman pontiffs,and the subordinate officers were emperors, kings, princes, bishops, and abbots. The army was that great host of devoted monks, of consecrated priests, and earnest Christian laymen. The weapons in the hands of these conquerors were Christian love and sympathy. They were driven on by an irresistible zeal for saving souls. They were clothed in the power of poverty, austerity, suffering, obedience, and self-denial. The conflict was one which, in its outcome, was to shape the destiny of the world.

The man above all others who was carried away

[1] Matt. x., 34.

by this dream of duty for the Church militant in winning those outside the true Church to membership, was the monk-Pope, Gregory the Great. Pagan Rome had failed to make a complete and permanent conquest of the barbarians. Christian Rome, inspired by this master spirit, was to succeed in conquering both the bodies and the souls of the barbarians, and to use them for her own glory.

When Gregory the Great died in 604, Christendom practically covered the Roman Empire and at certain points extended beyond it. Those who bore the name Christian included Jews, Romans, Greeks, Celts, and Germans. The Christian world was already divided into two great branches—the Eastern, or Greek Church, and the Western, or Roman Church,—which were becoming more and more pronounced in their differences.

The Christian missionary work, from the sixth to the twelfth century, must be viewed broadly as a process of civilisation, since the missionaries carried with them intellectual light, as well as spiritual truth, and paved the way for law and justice. They opened up channels through which the higher ideals and better institutions of the south might work northward to revolutionise agriculture, trade, social life, and general economic conditions. "The experience of all ages," said Neander, "teaches us that Christianity has only made a firm and living progress, where from the first it has brought with it the seeds of all human culture, although they have only been developed by degrees." [1]

Mediæval conversion to Christianity was, as a rule, tribal, or national, rather than individual, or personal, and consequently it took some time before satisfactory

[1] Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, 417.

fruitage was noticeable in the lives of the people. But it was a great victory to substitute the Christian for the pagan ideal. The agencies employed to carry out this process of conversion were: (1) missionaries, mostly Latin, Celtic, English, German, Greek, and Slavic monks; (2) the sword in the hands of a stern ruler; (3) the marriage of Christian women to pagan kings and princes; and (4) the recognised superiority of Christianity, Christian institutions, and Christian nations. It must be borne in mind, likewise, that some of the German tribes settled in the very heart of Christendom where Christian influences could operate directly and immediately.

The earliest successful conversion of the Teutons was to Arianism. That work was begun at least as early as the time of Constantine, because a Gothic bishop sat in the Council of Nicæa (325). Bishop Ulfilas (d. 381), the "Apostle to the Goths," called by Constantine the Great "the Moses of the Goths," [1] translated the Bible into Gothic [2] and won his countrymen to Arianism. St. Chrysostom in 404 established in Constantinople a school for the training of Gothic missionaries.[3] The Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Burgundians, and Vandals all embraced that faith. But the fervent and more aggressive missionary zeal of Rome gradually replaced Arianism in western Europe with orthodox Christianity—the Burgundians in 517, the Suevi in 550, the

[1] Philostorgius, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., 5.

[2] To do that Ulfilas had to invent an alphabet. Whether he translated the whole Bible or only a part of it is unknown, since only fragments of his work have come down to us. See Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament*, N. Y., 1883, 160; Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., 6; Philostorgius, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., 5; Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle to the Goths*, Lond., 1885.

[3] Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.*, v., 30.

Visigoths in 587, the Lombards, the last stronghold of Arianism in the West, in the eighth century.

The unparalleled missionary activity of the Roman Church was due of course primarily to religious enthusiasm, but other causes must also be taken into account. As a matter of self-preservation to protect herself from the inveterate paganism of the ancient world, on the one hand, and from the torrent of barbaric invaders, on the other, the conflict was thrust upon Rome and she must conquer or perish. Again the development of the hierarchy along the lines of the Petrine theory made it imperative that Rome should win and rule the West. The wise policy of winning kings first and nations afterwards was simply adopted from Roman imperial practice but it was eminently successful. It likewise enabled the Pope of Rome to control all missionary enterprise from his ecclesiastical capital, and to employ it for the further extension of the papal prerogative.

The results of the spread of Christianity over the Græco-Roman world have already been considered. That conquest decidedly modified the Apostolic Church in organisation, in ceremony, and in doctrine, and laid the foundations for the Roman and Greek Churches. The Romanised, monasticised Christian Church over which Gregory the Great ruled reveals the product of all these early influences. The conversion of the Teutons to Roman Christianity marks another new epoch not only in the history of the Church, but also in the history of the world. Just as from the Apostolic Church emerged the Roman Church with its pronounced differences, so from the Roman Church evolved the Teutonic-Roman Church, which in turn was strikingly unlike its prototype in several particulars. The

Germanised Roman Church declared its absolute independence of the Eastern Emperor and launched out on a new world career. The product of all these elements was the mediæval Church which stood for primitive Christianity modified first by a growth covering five centuries through a stratum of Roman civilisation, and secondly for seven centuries through a superimposed stratum of Germanic civilisation.

When the pagan Franks began their conquest of Gaul (486), they encountered a civilisation that was nominally Christian. Their king, Clovis, married Clotilda, a Christian princess, the daughter of the Burgundian king[1] (493). She no doubt laboured with her lord and master to induce him to embrace her faith. He permitted his child to be baptised in accordance with the Christian rite and tolerated Christian priests and monks as a matter of policy, but that was all. At length in a battle with the stubborn Alemanni, Clovis, hard-pressed, prayed to the Christian God and promised to turn Christian himself in exchange for victory. His foes fled and left him conqueror. True to his vow, Clovis, after receiving instruction from Bishop Remigius of Rheims, was baptised on Christmas day 496 and with him 3000 warriors. This important event, "the first step toward the world-historical union of Teutonic civilisation with the Roman Church,"[2] paved the way for Charles the Great, and made possible a Christian France. This event was a significant victory for the Nicene Creed and for the Pope of Rome. Orthodoxy and Roman dominion now advanced side by side with Frankish conquests until both became

[1] On the conversion of the Burgundians, see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii., 30.

[2] Richter, 36, n. 6; Bouquet, iv., 49. See Ogg, *Source Book*, §6.

absolutely independent of the imperial power in the East.[1]

The Romans abandoned the island of Britain in 409 for ever. About 450 the pagan kinsmen of the Franks, namely the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians, crossed to Britain and there found the Christian Church already planted.[2] They drove it back to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, or crushed it out altogether. The Christian Celts, who were thus treated, made no effort at first to convert their heathen conquerors.[3] That was left to missionaries from Rome under the leadership of the monk Augustine. Bede, the venerable Church historian, tells the pious tale of how Gregory the Great, before being made Pope, saw in the slave market of Rome some boys "of a white body and fair countenance" and forthwith became so deeply interested in them and their land that he begged the Pope to send him as missionary to Britain.[4] The Romans, it is said, refused to allow him to go, and soon honoured him with the tiara of St. Peter. As Pope, however, he carried out his intention by sending Augustine, a Benedictine abbot, with forty monks and Gallic interpreters and with letters and a library of sacred literature, to England in 596 to begin the work.[5]

[1] Perry, *Franks*, 488.

[2] Bede, i., 47; Lingard, i., 46; Haddon and Stubbs, i., 22–26; Pryce, *Anc. Brit. Ch.*, 31; Tertullian, *Against Judæos*, 7; Gildas; Ogg, *Source Book*, §8. The early history of the British Church is obscure. By the second century the Gospel had spread through the southern parts of the island. Three British bishops attended the Council of Arles, 314, and others were present at the Council of Sardica in 347 and the Council of Rimini in 359.

[3] Bede, i., 22.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii., ch. 1.

[5] Bede, i., 25. See *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, 2d ser., xii., *Epistles;* Haddon and Stubbs, iii., 5; Cheney, *Readings in Eng. Hist.*, N. Y.,

Now it happened that Ethelbert, the King of Kent, had married Bertha, a Christian princess from Paris, who had been permitted to take a Gallic bishop with her to England. Thus the way had been already opened for the favourable reception of the monks under the guidance of Augustine, which led in 597 to the conversion of Ethelbert at Canterbury, and with him nominally the whole kingdom of Kent. At the first Christmas festival Ethelbert and 10,000 of his subjects were baptised. Thus Roman Christianity became at once the established state Church and "everywhere the bishop's throne was set up side by side with the king's." [1] Augustine, as a reward for his successful services, was soon made the first archbishop of England [2] and proceeded to organise the Church by sending to Rome for more helpers, by appointing bishops and priests to particular fields of labour, by purifying pagan temples and dedicating them to Christian services, and by repairing and building Christian churches and monasteries. As a result of the sincere, practical measures adopted by Augustine, thousands were soon won to the new faith and Christianity was permanently replanted in the British Islands. The work, so well begun, was continued until Sussex, the last kingdom of the heptarchy, in 604, embraced the popular religion. Pope Gregory the Great took a keen interest in this grand triumph and made it contribute to the glory of the Roman Church.[3]

The monks sent to England by Pope Gregory the

1908, 46–52; Ogg, *Source Book*, §9; Thorne, *Chronicles of St. Augustine's Abbey;* Stanley, *Memorials of Canterbury*. See Allies, *Hist. of Ch. in Eng.*

[1] Bede, i., 26. See Green, *Short Hist. of Eng. People*, ch. 1, §1.

[2] He went over to Arles, France, to be consecrated. Bede, i., 27.

[3] Bede, i., 32.

Great soon came to see that the Celtic Church differed from theirs in many respects. Augustine himself, having concluded an alliance between Ethelbert and the Roman See, held several conferences with the Christian Celts in order to accomplish the most difficult task of their subjugation to Roman authority. These differences were largely ritualistic and disciplinary. The Celtic Christians celebrated Easter according to the calculation of Sulpicius Severus, while the Romans had another mode of computing the proper day.[1] The Celts appealed to St. John, the Romans to St. Peter.[2] The Celtic Church might be called a monastic Church, since the abbot ruled over the bishop.[3] The Celts shaved the front of the head from ear to ear as a tonsure, while the Romans shaved the top of the head leaving a "crown of thorns."[4] The Celts permitted their priests to marry, the Romans forbade it. The Celts used a different mode of baptism from that of the Romans, namely, single instead of trine immersion. The calendar for all movable festivals was not the same. The Celts held their own councils and enacted their own laws, independent of Rome. The Celts used a Latin Bible unlike the Vulgate, and kept Saturday as a day of rest, with special religious services on Sunday.[5] Notwithstanding these variances, which

[1] Until about seventy-five years previous Rome herself had used the same method of calculation. Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk, who instituted the practice of dating events from the birth of Christ, invented the new method the latter part of the fifth century. See Cutts, *Aug.*, 132.

[2] Skene, ii., 9; Killen, *Eccl. Hist. of Ire.*, i., 57.

[3] Bede, iii., 5.

[4] Bede, **v., 21.** The Greeks shaved the head completely. See Cutts, *Aug.*, 136.

[5] Bellesheim, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in Scot.*, Edinb., 1887–89, 4 vols., **i.**, 86.

do not seem to be at all on the fundamentals, there were many doctrinal and constitutional resemblances. Both churches were orthodox; both used a Latin ritual[1]; both had developed an episcopal organisation; both believed in monasticism; and both were actively engaged in missionary work. Nevertheless the British Christians looked with much disfavour upon the Augustine mission to convert their pagan conquerors and oppressors.

King Ethelbert in 602 arranged a conference of British and Roman bishops on the Severn in Essex.[2] At that gathering Augustine with unreasonable rigour and haughtiness demanded conformity; the Britains refused to surrender their independence. To settle the matter Augustine proposed that an appeal be made to a miracle. Accordingly a blind Anglo-Saxon was brought in. The Celtic clergy prayed over him in vain. Whereupon Augustine knelt and prayed, and immediately the blind man was restored to sight,[3] but the Celts refused to accept that act as final without the consent of a larger representation in the synod. The next year, therefore, a second council was held at which the persistent Augustine once more demanded conformity to Roman practices and the recognition of papal supremacy, and also requested missionary co-operation, but the Britains, displeased with Augustine's narrow dogmatism and apprehensive of the loss of their freedom, refused to submit. "As you will not have peace with brethren," said the stern Roman monk, "you shall have war from foes; and as you will

[1] Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Ch.*, Lond., 1881.

[2] Haddon and Stubbs, iii., 40.

[3] This incident is regarded as an interpolation in Bede's History. Hook, *Archbishops of Canterbury*, i., 68, 69.

not preach unto the English the way of life, you shall suffer at their hands the vengeance of death."[1] When, ten years later, a wholesale Saxon massacre of British Christians occurred, in which possibly a thousand priests and monks were slaughtered and many churches and monasteries destroyed, further conferences were at an end for fifty years.

It was not until 664 that the famous Council of Whitby was called by King Oswy of Northumbria in which Bishop Colman and Bishop Cedd, renowned Celtic divines, defended the British Church; while Bishop Agilbert, and Wilfred, the greatest English ecclesiastic of his time, championed Rome. In the discussion about the correct day for Easter, it was asserted by Wilfred that St. Peter held "the keys to the kingdom of Heaven." The king then asked Colman and the monks with him whether that was true, and they were forced to confess that it was. Consequently, feeling that it was safer to be on the side of Peter, the "doorkeeper," the king decided in favour of the Church of Rome.[2] This was a very significant victory for the See of St. Peter, because papal supremacy was now recognised in the British Isles, and likewise for the future of England, because it opened up a channel through which Roman Christian civilisation flowed into the British Isles to influence to a greater or less degree every institution in that country and, later, through the great empire which England was to build up to carry those cultural influences around the world. The work of cementing the Latin and Celtic churches in England into one was completed by Theodorus, the Archbishop of Canterbury

[1] Bede, ii., 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii., 25, 26.

(d. 690), and the Venerable Bede (d. 735). Ecclesiastical unity hastened political unity in England[1] and developed a common civic life among the divided peoples of the British Isles.[2]

Christianity had early spread from Britain to Ireland. The labours of St. Patrick[3] (d. 493) and the work of St. Bridget, the "Mary of Ireland" (d. 525), have become classics. The Anglo-Saxon invasion drove many Christians to Ireland in the fifth and sixth centuries, so that by the seventh century Ireland had become the "Island of Saints" and the whole island was Christianised. Many famous monasteries were planted, and an intense missionary zeal had sent to Scotland, North Britain,[4] France, Germany, Switzerland, and northern Italy many representatives of the Celtic Church.

In 629, Pope Honorius exhorted the Irish Church to conform to the Roman Easter day. A Celtic deputation was then sent to Rome and, upon returning home, reported in favour of the Latin system, which was adopted first in southern Ireland in 632, then in northern Ireland in 640, and by 704 was generally

[1] Greene, *Short Hist. of Eng. People*, ch. 1, §1. *Cf.* Love, *Early Eng. Ch. Hist.*, Lond., 1893, p. 94.

[2] Hunt, *Eng. Ch. in M. A.*, Lond., 1889; Ingram, *Eng. and Rome*, Lond. and N. Y., 1892; Newell, *Hist. of Anc. Brit. Ch.*, Lond., 1887; Alexander, *The Anc. Brit. Ch.*, Lond., 1889; Cathcart, *The Anc. Brit. and Irish Churches*, Phil., 1893; Soames, *The Lat. Ch. during Anglo-Sax. Times*, Lond., 1848.

[3] Todd, *St. Patrick the Apostle of Ireland*, Dub., 1864; Sherman, *Loca Patriciana;* Wright, *The Writings of St. Patrick*, Lond., 1889, 2d ed., 1894; Stokes, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, Lond., 1887; Cusack, *Life of St. Patrick;* De Vinne, *Hist. of Irish Prim. Ch.*, N. Y., 1870; Killen, *Eccl. Hist. of Ire.*, Lond., 1875; Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Ch.*, Lond., 1886; Olden, *The Ch. of Ireland*, Lond., 1892; Sanderson, *St. Patrick and the Irish Ch.*, N. Y., 1895.

[4] Bede, iii., 13, 19, 21.

observed. The Norman Conquest, in 1066, made the union of Ireland with Rome as well as with England more complete; but it was left to Henry II., who conquered Ireland in 1171, to give finality to the dependence of Ireland on Rome religiously and on England politically.

Christianity was planted in Scotland during the Roman period.[1] An Irish colony, converted by St. Patrick, settled there in the fifth century. The labours of St. Ninian (sixth cent.), the work of St. Kentigern (d. 603), and the activity of St. Columba (d. 597) completed the conversion of the country. St. Columba was a famous Irish missionary, who went to Scotland in 563, there converted the king of the Picts and founded many churches. He made his headquarters on the small island of Iona on which was planted a monastery famous as a school for missionaries, as the centre of educational activity, and as the Rome of the Celtic Church.[2] For centuries the Celtic Church maintained its independence in Scotland, but gradually gave way to the better organised and more aggressive Roman Church, though the Culdees were not absorbed until 1332.[3]

The enthusiasm of the Celtic and English Christians soon attained such proportions that it overflowed

[1] Haddon and Stubbs, ii., 103; Forbes, *The Kalendars of Scottish Saints;* Robertson, *Statuta Ecclesia Scoticanæ;* Cunningham, *Ch. Hist. of Scot.;* McLaughlin, *The Early Scot. Ch.;* Reeves, *Life of St. Columba;* Skene, *Keltic Scot.*

[2] Adamnan, *Life of St. Columba* (ed. by Reeves and Skene); Smith, *Columba;* Duke of Argyle, *Iona;* Montalemb., iii., 99; *Transl. and Reprints*, ii., No. 7; Skene, ii., 52.

[3] Calderwood, *Hist. of Kirk of Scot.*, Edinb., 1842–49, 8 vols.; Gordon, *Eccl. Chron. for Scot.*, Glasg., 1867, 4 vols.; Lightfoot, *Leaders in the Northern Ch.*, Lond., 1890; Dowden, *The Celtic Ch. in Scot.*, Lond., 1894.

and swept back upon the continent like a mighty tidal wave. The great pioneer in that movement was Columbanus. He was born in Leinster about 543 and received his monastic education at Bangor. At the age of forty he conceived the idea of preaching the Gospel to the pagan German tribes. With twelve young companions he crossed over to France where they remained several years, teaching the faith. Then they went to Burgundy where King Gontran persuaded them to build a monastery. For twenty years Columbanus laboured in the wild Vosges Mountains, planted the three famous monasteries of Anegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaines. Luxeuil virtually became the "monastic capital of France."[1] He gave his monks a stringent rule, borrowed from the rigid discipline of the Celtic monasteries, and he clung to the peculiar rites and usages of his mother Church. His influence was strongly felt and an army of disciples gathered around him. From his mountain home he sent forth reformatory waves that covered all Europe, and posed as sort of a spiritual dictator of the whole Church.

Another result of his influence was to incite the enmity of the Gallican clergy and the Burgundian court. In 602, he was arraigned before a Frankish synod, but he ably defended his life and his beliefs. This affront led him to appeal to Pope Gregory the Great in several interesting letters. At last, in 610, he was banished from the Burgundian kingdom never to return. He went to Tours, Nantes, Metz, up the Rhine valley, and into Switzerland where he remained three years engaged in active missionary work until forced to leave by Burgundian influence. Crossing the Alps into Lombardy he received an honourable welcome

[1] Montalembert, ii., 463.

from King Agilulf and was given a site for the celebrated monastery of Bobbio where, in 615, he passed away in peace. To him must be given the credit of opening up Europe to England and Ireland as an excellent field for foreign missions.[1]

Gallus,[2] an Irish companion of Columbanus, called the "Apostle of Switzerland," laboured among the Alemanni and Swabians. His monastery of St. Gall became one of the great centres of learning in the Middle Ages. He died in 645. Three other Irish monks of note worked in Germany. Fridolin founded a monastery on the Rhine near Basle. Trudbert went into the Black Forest and became a martyr to the cause. Kylian, the "Apostle of Franconia," went to Würzburg where he met with considerable success but lost his life.

The English were early drawn into this ardent missionary impulse. More missionaries were sent to Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries from England than go to-day to foreign fields.[3] Willibrord,[4] a native of Northumberland, educated in Ireland, embarked in 690 with seven assistants for Frisia at the mouth of the Rhine. The native prince was Radbod, an uncompromising pagan. Acting on the advice of Pepin of France he went to Rome and was invested with the bishopric of Utrecht. He then evangelised parts of Frankish Frisia, after which he visited Denmark. After a zealous career of half a century he died in 740. Other Englishmen followed in his wake. Adelbert laboured in the north of Holland,

[1] Univ. of Pa., *Transl. and Rep.*, ii., No. 7; see Maclear, *Apostles of Med. Europe*, 57–72. His life and works are in Migne, vol. 80.

[2] Migne, vol. 113. See *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*

[3] Smith, *Mediæval Missions*, 112.

[4] Migne, vol. 101. See *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*

Werenfrid near Elste, and Wiro among the natives of Guldres. The Ewald brothers were slain by the savage Saxons.[1] Wulfram, the Bishop of Sens, made excellent headway among Radbod's Frisians.[2] Indeed the zeal of these northern missionaries might have planted the Celtic Church firmly on the continent, had they not been so sadly deficient in capacity for organisation and had the Pope of Rome not been so zealously watchful.

Roman colonies on the Rhine in the third and fourth centuries first carried Christianity into Germany. In the Council of Arles (314) there were present a bishop and a deacon from Cologne, and a bishop from Treves. By the fifth century Christianity had been spread by Severinus,[3] an Italian monk, into Bavaria along the Danube.

It was really left to St. Boniface,[4] the "Apostle of Germany," to organise and unify the work already done, and to subject the Christian Church in Germany planted by his predecessors, to Rome. He was a most remarkable character and played an important part in the Christianisation of the Teutonic peoples. Born in 680 in Devonshire, England, of noble Saxon family, he early entered the monastery at Exeter, where he received an excellent education for that day. He soon evinced a longing for the life of a monk. His father gave his consent reluctantly, and he assumed monastic vows in a monastery near Winchester.

[1] Bede, v., 10.

[2] Mabillon, iii., 341–348; Maclear, *Apostles of Med. Europe*, 104–109.

[3] See *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*

[4] His original name was Winfried. At the wish of Pope Gregory II. he changed it to Boniface in 723. See Cox, *Life of Boniface*, Lond., 1853; Hope, *Boniface*, Lond., 1872.

He became a famous preacher and expounder of Scripture, and at the age of thirty was ordained priest. He now felt called upon to carry the Gospel to the land of his ancestors. Consequently in 716, with two or three fellow-monks as companions, he crossed from London to Frisia to begin his missionary labours as the successor of Willibrord, whose successes had been largely reversed. Radbod, the baptised Frisian king, had backslid when he learned that his pagan forefathers were among the damned. He declared that he preferred "to be there with his ancestors rather than in heaven with a handful of beggars." [1] Hence he had devastated the Christian churches and monasteries, and was now at war with Charles Martel. King Radbod met Boniface, but refused to permit him to preach, so Boniface returned to England without having accomplished anything.

Notwithstanding the failure of this first enterprise, Boniface left England again in 718 and for ever; and now went through France to Rome to obtain papal sanction for his future missionary work. Pope Gregory II. formally commissioned him as missionary to the German tribes (719). Armed with that letter and many precious relics, he started north the following spring to his field of labour. First, he went to Thuringia and Bavaria, regions already partly Christianised, but at this time considerably disorganised, and demanded their submission to Rome; then, learning of King Radbod's death (719), he hastened to Frisia, where he laboured for three years with Willibrord, who had meantime returned to continue his

[1] Discredited by Rettberg, *Kircheng. Deutschl.*, ii., 514. Mabillon, iii., 341, gives an interpolated life. See Maclear, *Apostles of Med. Europe*, 104.

labours. In 722 he passed through Thuringia and entered Hesse where, within a short time, he converted two local chiefs together with many thousands of their followers. A foothold was thus secured by Rome in the pagan world of Germany and never again lost.

These successes led the Pope to recall Boniface to Rome to receive directions concerning conditions in Germany. After exacting from him a confession of faith in the Trinity, and binding him by an oath ever to respect papal authority,[1] the Supreme Pontiff created him missionary bishop in 723. Boniface then returned to Germany with a code of laws for the Church, and with letters of introduction to Charles Martel and to other influential persons who might aid him. He was aware that little could be done without the assistance of that powerful ruler and wrote: "Without the protection of the Prince of the Franks, I could neither rule the people of the Church, nor defend the priests or clerks, the monks or handmaidens of God; nor have I the power to restrain pagan rites and idolatry in Germany without his mandate and the awe of his name."[2] Hence he attached himself for awhile to the court of the Frankish ruler before he began the work so near his heart. Hesse and Thuringia, Christianised nominally by Celtic missionaries and consequently under no episcopal authority, refused to recognise papal jurisdiction. To awe them into submission, Boniface cut down their gigantic sacred oak at Geismar and from it, subsequently, built a chapel to St. Peter. The people were convinced and received the new faith.

[1] This oath was similar to that taken by Italian bishops. Neander, v., 64–67.

[2] Jaffé, *Mon. Magunt.*, 157.

With the aid of Charles Martel, the assistance of the Pope, and the help of English missionaries who joined him, Boniface completed his conquest of that region, filled it with churches and monasteries, and extended papal rule over it. Schools were established, learning and a higher civilisation began to flow in from England and Rome, and the dark days of paganism were gone.

As a reward for his labours, Pope Gregory III., who received the papal crown in 731, raised Boniface in 732 to the dignity of missionary archbishop. This new authority enabled him to coerce refractory bishops who thwarted his efforts. Five years later, Boniface made his third and last visit to Rome, not now as an obscure missionary but with a great retinue of monks and converts. Once more returning to Germany with authority, he organised the Church in Bavaria (739) and thus curtailed ecclesiastical lawlessness by creating four bishoprics: Salzburg, Friesingen, Passau, and Regensburg. In the year 742, continuing the work of organisation begun so well in Bavaria, he succeeded in creating in central Germany the bishoprics of Würzburg, Buraburg, Erfurt, and Eichstädt. To organise the Church and regulate ecclesiastical affairs, he held numerous synods. At the same time, he laboured hard to enforce celibacy, to restore Church property alienated by rulers, and to suppress heresy. In 743, he was made archbishop of Mainz, with jurisdiction over a region from Cologne to Strassburg and from Coire to Worms, and now sought to complete the work of consolidating the German Church. By this time, he had become not only the head of the Church in Germany, but was recognised as a powerful factor in political matters. It is even reported that he crowned

Pepin at Soissons (752).[1] The great monastery of Fulda was founded (744) and it was destined to become the head of the Benedictine institutions in Germany. Having appointed Lull as his successor at Mainz, he resigned in 754, returned a third time to Frisia as a missionary, and there was slain in 755 as a martyr to the Christian cause. Boniface did more than any other one individual to carry Christianity to the German peoples and to tie the Church of Germany firmly to the papal throne. He was a civiliser and law-giver as well as a Roman missionary.[2] After the Apostle Paul he was probably the most eminent in missionary endeavour.

His work was continued by his disciple Willibald (b. 700), a relative, a pilgrim to Rome and the Holy Land, and a Benedictine monk, who was made bishop of Eichstädt (741). He called his brother, sister, and others from England as missionaries into Germany. He founded Benedictine monasteries, and it is thought by some that he wrote a biography of his great leader (d. 781). Gregory, an abbot of Utrecht, a Merovingian prince converted by Boniface, worked with his master and took charge of the Frisian mission after his death (755). Sturm, the first abbot of Fulda (710–779),[3] a Bavarian nobleman educated by Boniface, had his teacher's bones buried at Fulda and served for years as a missionary among the Saxons (d. 779). Charles the Great gave him support and encouragement.

[1] Rettberg and modern scholars deny the tradition.

[2] J. A. Giles edited the works of Boniface in 2 vols., in 1844. His disciple Willibald of Mainz wrote his life. Pertz, *Mon.*, ii., 33. Maclear, *Apostles of Med. Europe*, ch. 8. One of his sermons, on "Faith and the works of love," is given in translation in Neale, *Mediæval Preachers*.

[3] A famous monastery founded by Boniface.

Another means used to convert the Germans was the sword. This was especially true of the Saxons, a sturdy, defiant, warlike people, who lived in Hanover, Oldenburg, and Westphalia.[1] They were the last to accept Christianity, because they hated the Franks and far-off Rome. Fruitless efforts to convert them had been made by the Ewald brothers, Suidbert, and others. The work was left, however, for Charles the Great, who consumed thirty-three years in subjecting them to Christian rule (772–805).[2] This was done only after five thousand inhabitants had been massacred at Verdun, ten thousand families had been exiled in 804, and bloody laws were enacted against relapse into paganism. This new type of missionary work, which was a radical departure from the apostolic method, can be excused, perhaps, only when we take into consideration the moral standards of the age and the motives of Charles the Great. The best men of the time, however, like Alcuin vehemently opposed this method. After Charles had subjected the Saxons, he established among them eight bishoprics, Osnabrück, Münster, Minden, Paderborn, Verdun, Bremen, Hildesheim, and Halberstädt.

The Prussians, located to the north-eastward of the Saxons along the Baltic, stubbornly resisted efforts to Christianise them. Adelbert, Bishop of Prague (997), and his successor, Bruno, were both massacred by them. At length, a Cistercian monk, who was appointed the first bishop of Prussia in the twelfth century, made some headway among them, but was soon compelled to withdraw. Then followed the crusade of the

[1] Bede, v., 10.

[2] In 785, two of the most powerful Saxon chiefs, Wittekind and Abbio, submitted to baptism with Charles the Great as sponsor.

Teutonic Order (1230–1280) in which the methods of Charles the Great were employed and with the same results.

Christianity was first introduced into Denmark in the sixth and seventh centuries through raids on Ireland, commerce with Holland, and the story of the "white Christ." Willibrord was the first missionary.[1] When he was expelled from Friesland in 700 he went to Denmark, where he was received with favour by King Yngrin, organised a church, and bought thirty boys to be educated as missionaries. St. Sebaldus,[2] the son of a Danish king, was a product of this early missionary effort. Charles the Great ruled part of Denmark, carried on extensive trade with the people, located churches in Holstein and at Hamburg, and planned to convert all the Danes.[3] Louis the Pious, appealed to by King Harold Klak[4] to settle a family feud, sent Archbishop Ebo of Rheims and Bishop Halitgar of Cambray to Denmark in 822. Ebo made several journeys, later preached extensively, won many converts, baptised them, and built a church at Welnau. When, in 826, King Harold Klak fled to the Emperor for aid, he, together with his whole family and train, was converted and baptised at Ingelheim. Upon returning, the King took with him Ansgar, a Frank born at Amiens (800), who had been early trained as a missionary teacher and preacher, and who was to win the title of "Apostle of the North." He laboured in Denmark with some success, but in 829 was expelled, when Harold Klak was once more driven out, and went to Sweden

[1] Bede, v.

[2] The patron saint of Nuremberg.

[3] Jaffé, *Mon. Alc.*, Ep. 13.

[4] Denmark at this time was divided into many petty kingdoms.

until he was elected bishop of Hamburg in 831 with all Scandinavia as his see. In 846, Bremen was united to Hamburg and Ansgar was made archbishop. He soon succeeded in planting Christianity and with it monasticism in Denmark. His successor, Archbishop Rimbert (865–888), continued the spread of Christianity undisturbed; and his successors Adalgar (888–909), Unni (909–936), and Adaldag (936–988), had a comparatively clear field. The last of these saw the consecration of four native bishops, an increase in the possessions of the Church, and an organised struggle against heathenism. When the Danes made a conquest of England, the results were seen in the conversion of King Swen, a zealous worker for the Church, and his son Canute (1019–1035), who completed his father's work with the aid of English missionaries. So strong was the Church in Denmark by the twelfth century that a separate archbishop was appointed. The supremacy of the Roman Church was recognised.

The conversion of the Northmen has an interesting history.[1] The political situation in the tenth century opened the way for the introduction of Christianity. Hakon the Good, educated in England as a Christian, conquered and united all Norway, converted his followers, called over priests from England, and sought to force Christianity upon all his people, but in this failed. The sons of Eric, also Christianised in England, wrested the throne from Hakon the Good in 961, and likewise tried to uproot paganism, but they, too, were unsuccessful. Olaf, of romantic career, was called in 995 to rule. He, likewise, waged a crusade in behalf of Christianity and with such success that when he

[1] Maclear, *The Conversion of the Northmen.* Merivale, *Conversion of the Northern Nations.*

died in 1000, it had been permanently established. Olaf the Saint (1014–1030), however, completed the Christianisation of Norway and put it under the protection of the Archbishop of Bremen-Hamburg.[1]

As early as the eighth century, Culdee anchorites were accustomed to retire to Iceland from Scotland. In the ninth century Norwegians began to flee thither from the tyranny of their kings. Most of these emigrants were pagans, but one Norwegian convert in Saxony persuaded Bishop Frederick to go with him to Iceland where the bishop remained four years, but made little impression. Thougbrand journeyed thither in the tenth century, but likewise largely failed in his efforts. After the conversion of Norway, however, the intimate relations with Iceland soon produced different results. Christianity spread so rapidly that in 1000 the Christian religion was made the state religion. The first church built on the island was from timber sent by Olaf the Saint.[2]

Greenland was discovered and colonised by the bold Icelander, Eric the Red, in 986, and Eric's son was sent over by Olaf to plant the Christian Church there in 1000. The Church flourished there for four hundred years until disrupted by the Esquimos. About the year 1000 Vinland was discovered and thus the Gospel

[1] *Hermskringla: Chronicle of the Norse Kings.* Tr. by Laing, Lond., 1844, rev. ed. by Anderson, Lond., 1889, 4 vols. Also tr. by Morris and Magnusson, Lond., 1891, 2 vols. New ed. by York Powell. See Carlyle, *The Early Kings of Norway*, Lond., 1875, and Boyesen, *The Story of Norway*, N. Y. and Lond., new ed., 1890.

[2] The complete record of these early days is given in the *Biskupa Sögar*, ed. by Prof. Vigfusson, and pub. by the Icelandic Lit. Soc., 2 vols., 1858–61. See Elton, *Life of Laurence, Bishop of Halar*, Lond., 1890; Maccall, *The Story of Iceland*, Lond., 1887.

was known on the coast of New England five centuries before Columbus appeared.[1]

Like the Danes, the Swedes learned of Christianity through wars and conquests, and commercial relations. Björn, the Swedish King, asked Louis the Pious to send him Christian missionaries. Accordingly in 829 Ansgar, expelled from Denmark, went to Sweden where he laboured two years with some success. Five years later he sent Gautbert and Nithard to Sweden with a number of priests, but the pagan uprising killed all the priests and soon swept away all traces of Christianity. In 848 Ansgar made a pompous visit to Sweden again with costly presents and letters, and reopened the field for missionary work. By the eleventh century, the King of Sweden and his sons were baptised, and the work was pushed with renewed vigour, although it was not until the middle of the twelfth century that the conversion of Sweden was completed.

In the time of Charles the Great, the Slavs were located along the eastern side of his Empire; the Wends along the Baltic Sea between the Elba and the Vistula; the Poles along the Vistula; the Russians behind the Poles; the Czechs in Bohemia; and the Bulgarians back of the Danube and Balkan Mountains. Charles the Great had attempted to force the Wends to accept Christianity, but with no success. Otto the Great conquered them and likewise sought to convert them. He located bishoprics at Havelburg, Oldenburg, Meissen, Merseburg, and Zeitz, and an archbishopric at Magdeburg in 968 with Adalbert as the first archbishop. Reaction began in the time of Otto II., under the leadership of Mistiwoi, an apostate Christian, in which churches and monasteries were burned, and priests and monks

[1] See Winsor, *Nar. and Crit. Hist. of Am.*, i.

killed (983).[1] Later, Gottschalk, his grandson, an educated Christian monk, angered at the murder of his father (1032), led an anti-Christian crusade, but was defeated and then repented and ever after laboured hard to establish Christianity. The old bishoprics were restored and new ones created at Razzeburg and Mecklenburg; five monasteries were built; missionary work was encouraged; the liturgy was translated into Slavic; and the Church in that region became wealthy and powerful. But the heathen party, in a general uprising, killed Gottschalk and his old teacher (1066), destroyed the churches and monasteries, and once more slew the priests and monks. The final Christianisation of the Wends, therefore, did not take place until the middle of the twelfth century.

Charles the Great subjugated the Moravians, directed the Bishop of Passau to establish a mission among them, secured the conversion of their chief, Moymir, and founded the bishoprics of Olmütz and Nitra. Louis the German deposed Moymir on suspicion of treason and elevated Radislaw to power, but he soon turned against his benefactor and defeated him, formed an independent Slavic kingdom on the eastern boundary of Germany, and sent for Greek missionaries, two of whom, Cyrillus and Methodius, brothers and educated monks, were sent by the Greek Emperor Michael III. in 863.[2] Cyrillus understood the Slavic tongue and invented an alphabet and translated the liturgy into Slavic. He preached and celebrated service in the language of the people, and had a most able assistant in Methodius.

[1] Seized with remorse Mistiwoi tried to make amends, but his subjects abandoned him. He passed the remaining days of his life in a Christian monastery.

[2] Tozer, *The Ch. and the East. Emp.*, ch. 7.

They were very successful in their labours and built up a national Slavic Church. The German priests who had been labouring there for some time were driven out, and with them disappeared the Latin liturgy. Seeing their great success, Pope Nicholas I., in 868, invited them to Rome and won them to a friendly arrangement. There Cyrillus died in 869 but Methodius was returned as the Roman Archbishop of Pannonia. The Pope agreed both to the use of Slavic in the mass and to the independence of the Slavic Church under papal control. Ten years later Methodius made a second visit to Rome and a second agreement was entered into, satisfactory to both Rome and Moravia. He died before the ninth century ended, and before the close of the tenth century the Latin Church had replaced the Slavic. The expelled Slavic priests fled to Bulgaria to build up a new Church.

Neither Charles the Great, nor his son Louis, was able to conquer the Bohemians. When Bohemia became a dependency of Moravia, however, the way was opened for the introduction of Christianity. The Bohemian Duke Borziway and his family were converted, but reaction followed under Boleslav the Cruel. Otto I. in 950 completely defeated Boleslav, recalled the priests, and rebuilt the churches. The bishopric of Prague was established in 973, and under Archbishop Severus (1083) general laws were enforced concerning Christian marriage, observance of the Sabbath, and morality. The Latin language and the Roman ritual prevailed in the Bohemian Church.[1]

The first missionaries to Poland were Slavic, perhaps

[1] There are practically no original sources in English concerning the Slavic missions. Pelzel and Dabrowsky, *Rerum Bohemic. Scriptores*, contains most of the documents.

Cyrillus and Methodius. With the break-up of the Moravian kingdom, many nobles and priests fled to Poland and were kindly received. In 965 a Bohemian princess married Duke Mieczyslav and took priests with her. The Duke was converted and baptised and paganism was destroyed by force. The Church was then organised on the Latin-German model, and German priests were introduced. The first Polish bishopric was established at Posen subject to the Archbishop of Magdeburg. But it was to take many additional years before Roman Christianity was firmly established.

The Bulgarians, Slavic in institutions, but not in origin, captured Adrianople in 813 and carried away many Christian prisoners, among whom was the bishop himself, who began the conversion of their captors. In 861 a Bulgarian princess, returning from captivity in Constantinople as a Christian missionary to her own people, converted her brother, the Duke Bogoris. This work was supplemented by Methodius, who was sent there in 862 to help on the good work, and by other Greek missionaries who followed him. In 865 the baptised Duke of Bulgaria wrote to Pope Nicholas I. for Roman missionaries and asked one hundred and six questions about Christian doctrines, morals, and ritual. The Pope sent two bishops and elaborate answers to the questions,[1] but the Greek faith finally predominated.

The Magyars, who entered Europe in the ninth century and in 884 settled near the mouth of the Danube, finally located in present Hungary. They first learned of Christianity at the Byzantine court. In Hungary, however, they came in touch with

[1] Mansi, *Coll. Concil.*, xv., 401–434; Harduin, *Coll. Concil.*, v., 353–386.

the Roman missionaries. Otto the Great compelled them to receive missionaries from the Bishop of Passau. When Prince Geyza married a Christian princess, their conversion was rapid and complete. Adalbert of Prague visited the country and made a great impression. King Stephanus (997) made Christianity the legal religion, enforced the German ecclesiastical system, formed ten bishoprics, located an archbishopric at Grau on the Danube, built churches, schools, and monasteries, and received a golden crown from Pope Sylvester II. in 1000 as "His Apostolic Majesty."[1]

The Russians claimed St. Andrew for their apostle but probably actually learned of Christianity from Constantinople in the ninth century. Photius, in 867, told the Pope that the Russians were already Christians. A church was built at Kieff on the Dnieper, the Russian capital, and in 955 the grand-duchess, Olga, journeyed to Constantinople and was baptised. Grand-Duke Vladimir, the grandson of Olga, established Christianity at one sweep when he married Anne, the daughter of Emperor Basil and was baptised at his wedding in 988. Churches, schools, and monasteries spread rapidly all over the country, but the Greek Church instead of the Roman was firmly planted there, and in 1325, Moscow became the Russian Rome.[2]

While the Roman Church was winning new subjects all over northern and central Europe; she was losing nearly as much in territory and numbers in Africa and

[1] Thwrocz, *Chronica Hungarorum* in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, Vienna, 1746–8, i.

[2] The best collection of sources is Stritter, *Memoriæ populorum olim ad Danubium*, etc., Petropoli, 1771, 4 vols.; Karmasin, *Hist. of Rus.;* Mouravieff, *Hist. of the Ch. of Rus.*, Oxf., 1862; Stanley, *Lects. on the E. Ch.*, ix.-xii., Lond., 1862.

Spain. This loss was due to the rise of a rival religion in Arabia which bid fair to outstrip Christianity in the race for world conquest.

Mohammedanism, shortly after its birth (622), began to threaten Christianity. After having driven the Christian Church from northern Africa, the followers of Islam overthrew the Visigothic power in Spain (711) and then swarmed across the Pyrenees to overrun most of France. The very existence of Christendom was at stake, and the future of Europe hung in the scales and might have been very different, had not Charles Martel with his stalwart Christian knights in the bloody battle of Tours (732) checked the advance of the crescent and forced its adherents to hastily retrace their steps. The califate founded at Cordova (756) continued as a standing menace for more than six centuries. Meanwhile Moslem corsairs scoured the Mediterranean, seized Sicily, and from that vantage point sought to make a conquest of Italy venturing at times to the very gates of Rome.

The contest between the faithful of these two religions, continued for centuries and attained its climax in the crusades. The followers of each faith sought to either conquer or exterminate the other. This form of missionary work was like that employed by Charles the Great against the Saxons and Otto the Great against the Slavs. The repeated assaults of Frankish rulers, Spanish princes, and Norman warriors in Italy were finally successful and Islam was thrust back into Africa, but only to enter Europe by way of Constantinople.

In sharp contrast to these harsh methods, there are not a few instances of devout Christians labouring in love among the followers of the Prophet to save

their souls. Conversions to Christianity were not infrequent in Spain, Italy, Egypt, and the East.[1] The Franciscans and Dominicans both laboured heroically among the followers of the Prophet to teach them the higher and better faith.[2]

Notwithstanding the fact that Christianity spread so rapidly throughout the Roman Empire, yet it must be remembered that more than twelve centuries were to circle away before the cross was carried to all European peoples and planted among them. The problem was as difficult as that encountered to-day in Africa, Asia, and the islands of the seas. By the twelfth century all Europe, except Lapland and Lithuania had been won to Christianity. If the number of Christians approximated 30,000,000 at the death of Constantine, the number at the time of Pope Innocent III. in 1200 may have been 200,000,000 who came within the direct or indirect jurisdiction of the Christian Church. The sweeping control of the Roman Church gathered under her broad ægis possibly 100,200,000. Through these missionary activities, therefore, the successor of St. Peter had extended his actual sway until it included all of western and central Europe with a population as large as that of the Empire of Cæsar at the birth of Christ.

This unprecedented increase in dominion and subjects carried with it a corresponding change in the power, duties, wealth, and opportunity of the Papacy. The Pope of Rome became the greatest force in the West and one of the greatest in the world. The

[1] Muir, *Annals of Early Califate;* Oakley, *Hist. of Saracens;* Condé, *Dominion of Arabs in Spain;* Freeman, *Hist. and Conquest of Spain.*

[2] See Chap. xxi.

hierarchy was necessarily extended and elaborated. The number of officers, both locally and in the ecclesiastical court at Rome, was greatly increased. The rapid addition of so many sturdy recruits to the Roman Church, carried on for centuries, gave the Western Church a pronounced ascendency over the Eastern Church. Papal prerogatives, which were little more than assertions in the early period, became realities. As a result of these heroic and persistent missionary efforts, the mediæval Church, at the end of the missionary period, had attained its highest power.

A stream is coloured and influenced in its purity by the soil and rock through which it flows. An institution is modified by the peoples through whom it passes. It is not a matter of surprise to the historical student, in consequence, to see the Christian Church reflecting the civilisation through which it grew. Christianity may easily be reduced to the fundamental Gospel principles taught by Jesus, but in that pure, simple form it was not spread over the world and perpetuated. Originating on Jewish soil, it never outgrew the Jewish tinge. During the post-apostolic period it was powerfully modified by the classical philosophy of Rome, Greece, and Alexandria. In post-Constantinian times the multitudes of heathen converted to Christianity introduced heathen modifications and compromises. The spread of the Church to Teutonic soil, there to encounter a sturdy barbarism in most intimate relations, produced modifying influences which can easily be seen in the history of the Church. The Germanic contribution was to prove to be one of the most important and influential forces in the whole history of the Church, because it created, in

a large sense, modern civilisation and the modern Church.

This period of zealous missionary endeavour among the Celtic and Teutonic tribes was a great pioneer movement. Far too little attention has been paid to it by historians and, consequently, comparatively small credit has been granted to it as a force in the evolution of our institutions to-day. It is impossible to conceive what would have been the history of Europe and the civilisation she has planted around the earth had not Christianity entered at this epoch to lay the foundations. Every institution would have developed differently and the world would certainly not be what it is to-day.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

I.—ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND. See Gross, *Sources and Lit. of Eng. Hist.*

1.—Gildas (d. 570), *Works.* Transl. by J. A. Giles. Bohn Lib.

2.—Bede (d. 735), *Ecclesiastical History of England.* Various eds.

3.—Neimius (d. 9th cent.). *History of the Britons* (to 642). Bohn.

4.—Ethelwerd (d. 988), *Chronicle* (to 959). *Ib.*

5.—Asser (d. 909), *Life of Alfred* (to 893). *Ib.*

6.—Geoffrey (d. 1154), *British History* (to 688). *Ib.*

7.—Henry of Huntingdon (d. 1155), *History of England. Ib.*

8.—Florence of Worcester (d. 1118), *Chronicle. Ib.*

9.—Earle, J., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles.* Lond., 1865.

10.—Plummer, C., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles.* Lond., 1889.

11.—Giles, J. A., *Patres Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.* Lond., 1843–8. 19 vols. Works of thirteen Fathers. Parts in Eng.

12.—The *Pipe Rolls.* Lond., 1884–1900. 24 vols.
13.—*English Historical Society Publications.* Lond., 1838–50. 27 vols.
14.—Mason, A. J., *The Mission of St. Augustine to England according to the Original Documents.* Camb., 1897.
15.—Haddon, A. W., and Stubbs, W., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* Lond., 1869–71. 3 vols. Some transl. and fine Eng. notes.
16.—Johnson, J., *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England* (to 1519). Oxf., 1850.
17.—Foxe, J., *Acts and Monuments.* Lond., 1563. Best ed. by Pratt and Stoughton. Lond., 1877. 8 vols.
18.—Gee, H., and Hardy, W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Lond., 1896.
19.—Colby, C. W., *Selections from the Sources of English History.* Lond. and N. Y., 1899.
20.—Lee, G. C., *Leading Documents of English History.* Lond., 1900.
21.—Stevens, H. M., and Adams, G. B. *Select Documents of English Constitutional History,* N. Y., 1901.
22.—Univ. of Pa., *Translations and Reprints,* ii., No. 7.

II.—FRANCE:

1.—Masson, G., *The Early Chroniclers of France.* Lond., 1879.
2.—Gregory of Tours, *Ecclesiastical of the Franks.* Univ. of Pa. Tr. announced.

III.—GERMANY:

1.—Boniface, *Works.* A few letters translated in preface of Giles, *Patres Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.*

Bibliographical note:—Much valuable material for England has not yet been translated into English. For France, Spain, Germany, Scandinavia and the Slavic lands practically all the material is in Latin. Some of the chief sources are: Pertz, *Monumenta;* Mansi, *Sacrorum;*

Migne, *Patrologiæ;* Niebuhr, *Corpus Byzantinæ;* Jaffé, *Monumenta* and *Regesta;* Potthast *Regesta;* Bolland, *Acta;* Pelzel and Dabrowsky, *Rerum Bohemis;* Hübner, *Inscriptiones Britanniæ Christianæ.*

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Aikman, J. L., *Cyclopædia of Christian Missions.* Lond., 1861.

2.—Allen, J. R., *Monumental History of the Early British Church.* Lond., 1889.

3.—Bliss, E. M., *Encyclopædia of Missions.* N. Y., 1891. 2 vols.

4.—Briggs, F. W., *Missions: Apostolic and Modern.* Lond., 1864.

5.—Burkitt, F. C., *Early Christianity outside of the Roman Empire.* Camb., 1899.

6.—Charles, Mrs. R., *Early Christian Missions in Ireland, Scotland and England.* Lond., 1893.

7.—Choules, J. O., and Smith, T., *Origin and History of Missions.* Bost., 1842. 2 vols.

8.—Hole, C., *Early Missions to and within the British Isles.* Lond., 1888. *Home Missions in the Early Mediæval Period.* Lond., 1889.

9.—Kingsmill, J., *Missions and Missionaries.* Lond., 1853.

10.—Maclear, G. F., *Apostles of Mediæval Europe.* Lond., 1869. *History of Christian Missions during the Middle Ages.* Camb., 1863. *Conversion of the Celts.* Lond., 1879. *Conversion of the Slavs.* Lond., 1879. *Conversion of the English.* Lond., 1879. *Conversion of the Northmen.* Lond., 1879.

11.—Merivale, C., *Conversion of the West.* N. Y., 1879. 5 vols. *The Conversion of the Roman Empire.* Boyle Lect. Lond., 1864. *The Conversion of the Northern Nations.* Boyle Lect. Lond., 1865.

12.—Newell, E. J., *St. Patrick.* Lond., 1878.

13.—Smith, F., *The Origin and History of Missions.* Bost., 1842.

14.—Smith, G., *Short History of Christian Missions.* N. Y., 1884.

15.—Smith, R. T., *The Church in Roman Gaul.* Lond., 1878.
16.—Smith, T., *Mediæval Missions.* Edinb., 1880.
17.—Snow, T. B., *St. Gregory the Great.* Lond., 1892.
18.—Summers, W. H., *Rise and Spread of Christianity in Europe.* N. Y., 1894.
19.—Taylor, A. T., *How Christianity Conquered the Roman Empire.*
20.—Walrond, T. F., *Christian Missions before the Reformation.* Lond., 1873.
21.—Wyse, J., *Missionary Centres of the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1872.

II.—GENERAL:

Adeney, ch. 8. Alzog, ii., ch. 1. Anderson, J., *Scot. in Early Chr. Times.* Butler, ch. 46–49. Cheetham, ch. 14. Coxe, Lect. 2, sec. 28–30; Lect. 4, sec. 1–3. Crooks, ch. 31. Darras, i., 54, 269, 329, 333–336, 399; ii., 254. Döllinger, ii., ch. 2; iii., ch. 1. Foulkes, ch. 5–10. Fisher, 45 *f.*, 145 *f.*, 163. Gieseler, 2d pd., sec. 107, 108, 122–126, 134; 3d pd., sec. 16, 37–40, 44. Gilmartin, i., ch. 24–26. Godkin, *Hist. of Hung.* Godwin, *Hist. of Fr.* Greene, *Hist. of M. A.* Guericke, sec. 65–68. Hardwick, ch. 1, 5, 9, 13. Hase, sec. 148–156. Hore, ch. 6, 8. Hurst, i., 556–599, 619. Kurtz, i., 397–401, 440–482; ii., 1–13. Mahan, bk. 4, ch. 12. Masson, *Early Chroniclers of Fr.* Milman, i., bk. 3, ch. 2; ii., bk. 4, ch. 3–5. Moeller, i., 535–541. Neander, iii., 1–84, 271–346. Pressensé, bk. i., ch. 1. Robertson, bk. 2, ch. 13. Schaff, pd. 3, ch. 1, pd. 4, ch. 3.

CHAPTER XIII

SEPARATION OF THE ROMAN AND GREEK CHURCHES

OUTLINE: I.—Relation of the Greek and Roman Churches before 325. II.—Effect of the Arian Controversy on the situation. III.—The history of image worship. IV.—Character and results of the Iconoclastic Controversy. V.—Final separation. VI.—Resemblances and differences between the two churches. VII.—Sources.

ROME conquered Greece by military force (146 B.C.); meanwhile Greece made a more thorough conquest of Rome by ideas. While there were many significant differences in language, customs, education, and institutions, yet religiously they were united in a twofold way: (1) by a common paganism, and (2) by Christianity. The East was philosophical, contemplating, metaphysical, and keen in discrimination; the West was practical, legal, and aggressively conservative. This difference in temperament was destined to have marked historical results.[1] While the West produced the mediæval Church, the East remained comparatively stationary. When the seat of Roman empire was removed from the Eternal City to Constantinople in 330, it appeared as if the eastern world had again become triumphant.

A divergence between the churches of the East and the churches of the West, can be detected in the Christian philosophy and Christian theology from the beginning. The differences became more pronounced as the

[1] Tozer, *The Ch. and the East. Emp.*, 172.

years passed by. The Arian Controversy (see Ch. IX.) produced the first crisis in the breach between Roman and Greek Christianity. The victory won by the West over the East was only temporary, however, because in the end the powerful state was arrayed on the side of the Eastern Church. The adoption of the "filioque" clause to the Nicene Creed by the Western Church, gave mortal offence to the Greeks. The doctrine of purgatory was another irreconcilable difference. Theoretically the Church was still united: (1) in the Emperor who ruled both wings of the old Empire; (2) in the Pope who pretended to rule over the East and the West; and (3) in the fundamental Christian principles. While there were still many resemblances, the differences were also becoming well marked in Church polity and organisation, in dogma, in rites and, ceremonies, in monasticism, and in missionary activity.

Among the matters in dispute was the growing differentiation of opinion on the question of the marriage of the clergy. The Roman Church was much more strict in the enforcement of celibacy. The two churches refused to agree on the same universal councils, and, of course, as a result, accepted an unequal number of canons as valid. Neither could they agree on the proper day for celebrating Easter. There were also many minor differences in reference to such trivial things as the tonsure, the beard, priestly garments, and Lent. Another stumbling-block was set up when the dispute arose over the sacramental bread in the eucharist. In the ninth century the Western Church departed from the earlier practice of using fermented bread and insisted on the unleavened bread as in the Jewish passover.

The second crisis in the separation arose in connection with the Iconoclastic dispute. In the ancient religions, image worship appeared, but usually in the second stage of development. Max Müller contends that in India "the worship of idols is a secondary formation, a later degradation of the more primitive worship." The ancient Persians had no images.[1] The same was true of the ancient Greeks.[2] The earliest statue in Rome, that of Diana, was between 577 and 534 B.C.[3] The old Germans had neither temples nor images of their invisible gods.[4] Among the Jews, too, reference to images seemed to point to a later period of their history.[5] From the time of the Maccabees, however, a strong antipathy to images of all kinds developed.[6] Hence Origen asserted of the Jews that "there was no maker of images among their citizens; neither painter, nor sculptor was in their state."[7] The Jewish Christians, therefore, were imbued with a strong dislike to all images. Many heathen converts, likewise, fully appreciating the great difference between the Gospel and the idolatrous religion which they had forsaken, had the same feeling. Consequently, it may be said that the early Christians universally condemned all heathen image worship and all customs connected with it.

[1] Herodotus, bk. 1, 132; Strabo, 732.

[2] Schoemann, *Griech. Alterthümer*, ii., 197; see Alex., *Strom.*, i., ch. 5, §28; ch. ii., §77.

[3] Preller, *Roman Mythology*, i.; Plutarch, *Numa*, c. 8; Aug., *City of God*. iv., ch. 31.

[4] Grimm, *Teutonic Myth.*, i., 104.

[5] Ex. 20:4, 5; 25:18–20, 26:1; 32:4; 36:35; Deut. 4:15–18; 5:8, 9; 32:17; Gen. 31:19; Judg., 17:5; 18:30; Hos. 3:4; Zach. 10:2; 2 Kings 13:24; 1 Sam. 19:13, 16; Lev. 17:7; Ps. 106:37; 1 Kings 6:23, 32, 35; Isa. 40:44; 30:22; Joseph, *Antiq.* xv., 8, 12; xviii., 3, 1.

[6] Joseph., *Antiq.*, xv., ch. 8, §1–2; *Jewish Wars*, i., ch. 33, §2–3.

[7] *Against Celsus*, iv., 31.

The adoration of the reigning Emperors was especially denounced.[1] Christians were at first too poor and obscure to adorn their meeting places with art. In fact, the pagans accused them of having "no altars, no temples, no known images."

There is evidence, however, that the use of images by the Christians began comparatively early and that it was more marked in the art-loving East than in the West. Irenæus (2d cent.) says that a secret sect, the Gnostics, "possess images, some of them painted, and others formed of different kinds of material. . . . They crown their images and set them up along with the images of the philosophers." [2] But these Gnostics were heretics. Emperor Alexander Severus (222–235) had images of several characters of Scripture including Jesus, in his *Lararium*. But he was a pagan. The catacombs of the second, third, and fourth centuries are covered with paintings of sacred emblems, such as the lamb, olive branch, Christ carrying the cross, anchor, ship, fish, sower, cross, Christ with the lost sheep on his shoulder, bottle of wine, and other representations.[3] These emblems were used in the first instance in private houses. The first undisputed proof of the use of art in public worship among the orthodox is found in a decree of the Synod of Elvira, Spain, in 306, that "pictures ought not to be placed on a church lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted on walls."[4] Tertullian (b. 150) says that the communion cup usually bore a representation of the Good Shep-

[1] Rev. 15:2.

[2] *Her.* i., ch. 25, 6; Aug., *Her.* ch. 7.

[3] Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotteranæ;* Northcote, *Epitaphs of the Catacombs.*

[4] Hefele, i., 151.

herd.[1] He likewise says that the formation of the cross with the hand was very common. "At every journey and movement, at every coming in and going out, at the putting on of our clothes and our shoes, at baths, at meals, at lighting of candles, at going to bed, at sitting down, whatever occupation employs us, we mark our forehead with the sign."[2] Clement of Alexandria early in the third century mentions the dove, fish, ship, lyre and anchor as suitable emblems for Christian signet rings.[3] Constantine had the cross set up beside his own statue, in 312, after the defeat of Maxentius.[4] He also had a costly cross in his palace[5] and had the emblem engraved on the arms of his soldiers.[6] Before the middle of the fourth century, Bible manuscripts were beautifully illuminated and illustrated. This evidence shows that the use of images in worship began in the second century and increased with the growth of the Church until by the fourth century it was a marked institution in Christendom. There were three distinct phases of its development: (1) the use of the cross; (2) the employment of emblems and symbols; (3) the appearance of portraiture and pictorial images.

The growth of image worship from the fourth to the eighth centuries was due to certain explainable causes. The victory of Christianity under Constantine brought a wholesale conversion of pagans to the new faith, wealth, power, and extraordinary activity in building churches. What was more natural than that the

[1] *De Pud.*, 7, 10.
[2] *De Cor. Mil*, c.. iii.,; *Ad. Uxor.*, ii., 5.
[3] *Paed.*, iii., 11., §59.
[4] Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, ix., 9.
[5] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 49.
[6] Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.*, i., 8.

architectural and artistic ideas of the day should be employed in beautifying them? The Christian Emperor himself set the example of using sacred pictures by embellishing his new capital with religious representations, such as Daniel in the Lion's Den and Christ as the Good Shepherd. Constantine's successors in showering their favours upon the Christians, cultivated this practice. It must be remembered, too, that Christianity had become more material and worldly than it was in the Apostolic Age. The conversion of the masses to Christianity was merely nominal and external. What was more natural than that they should bring with them their pagan ideas and love for show and ostentation, and that they should clamour for a material representation of their new faith?

Following popular opinion and obeying private demands, the clergy themselves became champions of the use of images. In the West, Pope Gregory the Great gave his official sanction to the institution. Along with the use of images grew up, out of the spiritual worship of saints and martyrs, the worship of their relics and their images, and pilgrimages to the scenes of their labours. The ignorance and superstition of the period supplied an excellent atmosphere for this marvellous evolution. It appears, then, that the Christian Church, planted in the home of paganism, supported largely by converts from paganism, in a barbarous, credulous age such as that, naturally developed and abused the use of art in worship.

Poetry, music, painting, sculpture, and architecture all are unquestionably legitimate handmaids of religion and may be made most serviceable. But the use of images for ornament, instruction, and enjoyment is one thing; the worship of images is quite another thing.

In the Middle Ages only a few lofty souls here and there took the true view. Pictures were put into churches not as objects of art, but as aids and objects of worship. The pictures were reverently kissed, bows and prostrations were made before them, candles and lamps were used to illuminate them, and incense was burned to honour them.

During this period, we have a number of excellent illustrations of image worship. Constantine used art to beautify his new capital in the East, and particularly to adorn his palace. Constantia, his sister, asked Eusebius for an image of Jesus.[1] The veneration of the cross became especially pronounced after its adoption by Constantine, and it was used in all religious ceremonies as an emblem of the victory of Jesus over sin and the devil. According to Jerome the sign of the cross was made, as it is to-day, in witness to written documents.[2] Emperor Julian (361) taunted the Christians thus: "Ye worship the wood of the cross, making shadowy figures of it on the forehead, and painting it at the entrance to your houses." St. Chrysostom (b. 347) wrote:

> The sign of universal execration, the sign of extremest punishment, has now become the object of universal longing and love. We see it everywhere triumphant. We find it in the houses, on the roofs and the walls; in cities and villages; on the markets, the great roads and in the deserts; on mountains and in valleys; on the sea, on ships; on books and on weapons; on wearing apparel; in the marriage chamber; at banquets; on vessels of gold and silver; in pearls; in pictures on the walls and on beds; on the bodies of brute animals that are diseased; on the bodies of those pestered by evil spirits; in the dances of

[1] See Book iv., Letter 30. [2] *Comm. on Ezek.*, ix., 4.

those going to pleasure; in the associations of those that mortify their bodies.[1]

Nilus, a disciple of Chrysostom, permitted the use of the cross and pictoral Bible stories in the churches, but opposed images of Jesus and the martyrs.

Churches began to be decorated in the fourth century, and in the fifth paintings and mosaics were introduced. Constantine had "symbols of the Good Shepherd" placed in the forums of Constantinople.[2] The Holy Ghost was commonly represented as a dove over the altar or the font.[3] The Nestorian Controversy and the Eutychian discussion helped to introduce pictures of the blessed Virgin and the Holy Child, Jesus. St. Cyril advocated the use of images in the fifth century so clearly that he has been called the "Father of image worship." By the fifth century, churches[4] and Church books, palaces and huts, and cemeteries were covered with images of Christ and the saints painted by the monks, while representations of the martyrs, monks, and bishops were found everywhere. Even pictures of the Trinity were in common use. In the East, women decorated their dresses with personal images and pictures, such as the marriage feast of Cana, the sick man who walked, the blind man who saw, Magdalene at the feet of Jesus, and the resurrection of Lazarus. Portraits of Peter and Paul covered the walls at Rome. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Gregory the Great, and many others of the Fathers, testified to the widespread employment of

[1] *Contra Judae. et Gentil*, §9; see Neander ii., 286.
[2] Euseb., *Life of Const.*, iii., 49.
[3] Kugler, *Handbook of Painting.*
[4] Smith and Cheetham, art. on "Images," p. 816 *ff.*

images both for public and for private worship. The ceremony of kissing the image, of burning incense to it, of bowing before it, and of praying to it, was gradually developed and became very marked in the sixth century. The climax, however, was reached in the eighth century when the paint was literally scraped off the images and put into wine to make it holier, and when the consecrated bread was laid upon the image for a special blessing.[1]

When the portrait phase of image worship developed, pictures of miraculous origin were produced and superstitious practices began to abound. Not a few pictures of sacred characters were attributed to Luke. Others were described as "the God-made images, which the hand of man wrought not." It was but a short step to attribute miracles and cures to these images of divine origin.[2] To the wonder-working pictures was ascribed motion, speech, and action. Out of such conditions direct idolatry could easily develop.

The theory of the educated concerning images differed very much from that of the ignorant. The images were worshipped by the masses because it was believed that such worship drew down the saint into the image, an idea which came from the pagan belief concerning the statues of Jupiter and Mercury. Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis, near the end of the sixth century, said: "The images are not our gods; but they are the representations of Christ and his saints, which exist and are venerated in remembrance and in honour of these, and not as ornaments of the church."[3] To a hermit

[1] *Imper. Decr. de Cultu Imag.*, 618, ed., Goldast, Frankf., 1608.

[2] Greg. of Tours, *Mirac.*, i., 22, 23; *Apol.* in Act 4, *Conc. Nic.*, ii.; Labb. vii., 240.

[3] *Apol.* in *Act* 4, *Conc. Nic.*, ii.; Labb., vii., 237.

who asked for some pious symbols, Pope Gregory the Great sent a picture of Jesus and images of the Virgin Mary, St. Peter, and St. Paul, with this admonition:

> I am well aware that thou desirest not the image of our Saviour that thou mayest worship it as God, but to enkindle in thee the love of Him whose image thou wouldst see. Neither do we prostrate ourselves before an image as before a deity, but we adore Him whom the image represents to our memory as born or seated on the throne; and according to the representation, the correspondent feelings of joyful elevation, or of painful sympathy, are excited in our breasts.[1]

Images were put into churches "only to instruct the minds of the ignorant." Again, he explained the use of images thus: "It is one thing to worship a picture and another to learn from the language of a picture what that is which ought to be worshipped. What those who read learn by means of writing, that do the uneducated learn by looking at a picture."[2]

The most eloquent of all the apologists of images, John of Damascus, gave this explanation:

> I am too poor to buy books and I have no leisure for reading. I enter the church choked with the cares of the world. The glowing colours attract my attention and delight my eyes like a flowering meadow; and the glory of God steals imperceptibly into my soul. I gaze on the fortitude of the martyr and the crown with which he is rewarded, and the holy fire of emulation kindles within me and I receive salvation.[3]

It must be remembered that, however clearly the

[1] Book ix., Letter 52.

[2] *Epist. ad eund.*, ix., 9. See *Ep.*, vii., 111.

[3] *On Holy Images*, ii., 747.

teachers of the Church might see the difference between the right use of images to instruct the unlettered and to excite a spiritual feeling, on the one hand, and a superstitious worship of images, on the other, the ignorant masses did not make the distinction in either thought or practice, and therein lay the great abuse.

From the death of Gregory the Great in 604 until the outbreak of the Iconoclastic Controversy in 716, twenty-five Popes ruled in Rome. With several exceptions they were ecclesiastics of no historical importance. To say that they lost nothing of the ground gained by Gregory the Great is to say much for them. But in addition they made some progress in the evolution of the mediæval Church. On this question of the use of images in worship they uniformly continued the policy of Gregory the Great.

Opposition began as early as the use of images. Irenæus in the second century (167) denounced the practice.[1] Turtullian (192), quoting the second of the Ten Commandments, severely denounced all use of images as sinful.[2] Clement of Alexandria (192) took the same view.[3] Origen also based his opposition to the practice upon the Jewish interpretation.[4] Minutius Felix (220) argued that man was the image of God, hence there was no need of any artificial representations.[5] Lactantius (303) held that since the spirit of God could be seen everywhere, His image "must always be superfluous."[6] Arnobius (303) took the same view.[7]

[1] *Adv. Her.*, i., c. 25, §6.
[2] *De Spect.*, c. 23; *Adv. Herm.*, c. 1; *De Idolatr.*, c. 4.
[3] *Pratrept.*, c. 4, §62; *Strom.*, vii., c. 5, §28.
[4] *Adv. Celsus*, iv., §31; viii., §17.
[5] *Octav.*, c. 9.
[6] *Instit.*, ii., c. 2; *Epit.*, c. 25.
[7] *Adv. Gent.*, iii.

Christians were told to carry God and His Son in their hearts and not to attempt to procure their images. The Spanish Synod of Elvira (306) excluded images from the churches.[1] The early Fathers, taken altogether, looked with but little favour upon the misuse of images in worship. Eusebius, in replying to the request from Constantia for an image of Christ, wrote a famous letter in opposition to the practice which virtually became the platform of the Iconoclastic party.[2] St. Augustine (393) declared that "It is unlawful to set up such an image to God in a Christian temple."[3] Epiphanius (d. 402) with his own hands tore down a curtain which had an image on it in a little village church in Palestine. This seems to be the first act of Iconoclasm.[4] Asterius (d. 410), Bishop in Pontus, opposed wearing Bible pictures on clothing and told his people to wear the image of Christ in their hearts.[5] Xenius (end of sixth century), the Monophistic Bishop of Hierapolis, destroyed the images of the angels in his church and hid those of Jesus.[6] In 518, the clergy of Antioch complained to the Patriarch of Constantinople that their Patriarch had melted down the images of gold and silver hung over the font and the altar.[7] Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, early in the seventh century, threw the images out of his churches. Pope Gregory the Great praised him for his zeal, but still justified the use of images.[7] The Jews and the Moham-

[1] Can. 36; Mansi, ii., 264. See Hefele, i., 151.
[2] *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, 198; Mansi, xiii., 313.
[3] *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 7.
[4] Migne, ii., 517–527.
[5] Kurtz, i., 364.
[6] Fleury, l., xxx., 18.
[7] *Ib.*, xxxl., 39. See Smith and Cheetham, art "Images."
[8] Bk. xi., Ep. 13. Read Neander, iii., 199 ff.

medans in the seventh century fiercely assailed the Christian veneration of images as idolatry. This crystallised the Iconoclastic elements of opposition into a party. Finally, in the eighth century, the secular head, Leo III., the Isaurian (716–741), championed the Iconoclastic cause. His son, Constantine V. (741–775), carried it forward. The Synod of Constantinople in 754 officially condemned the use of images,[1] and this marks the climax of the movement.

It was not long now before there appeared in Christendom two distinct parties: (1) The Iconolatræ, or image worshippers, who were composed of the leading churchmen like Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and John of Damascus in the East; the monks, the common clergy, and the masses of the common people in the East, and Pope Gregory II. and the powerful Church of the West. (2) The Iconoclasti, or image breakers, who included the Emperor and his civil officers; his army, made up mostly of barbarians and Asiatic heretics[2]; a few churchmen like Anastasius, who succeeded the deposed Germanus, actuated by political motives; and the Carolingian rulers in the West.

The conflict was begun by Leo III., the Isaurian, a soldier of fortune, who through ability as a warrior had won the imperial crown,—a powerful ruler in falling Greece,—active, sincere, illiterate, honest, despotic, and unwise. Ambition to convert the Jews, Mohammedans, and Montanists made him feel keenly the sting of their sarcastic attacks on images.[3] One

[1] These images were mosaics, frescoes, and movable flat icons like those found in the East to-day. It is very unlikely that statues were used in this early period.

[2] Finlay, i., 387; ii., 27–29.

[3] In 722 he ordered the Jews and Montanists to be baptised by force.

of his advisers, Beser, was a converted Mohammedan, who had held numerous interviews with Islam leaders. As a zealous supporter of the Catholic Church, Leo no doubt sincerely desired to restore the primitive simplicity of Christian worship. As monarch and priest, he believed himself called upon by God to root out idolatry. He was undoubtedly a noble puritan in his purposes and motives and called himself a second Josiah.

In 726, he issued the first edict against images, authorising their destruction[1] and the next year the exarch promulgated it in Ravenna and the West. This was opposed by the patriarch, Germanus, and most of the clergy; hence, it was enforced only in a few places where the bishops supported the Emperor. The following incident will illustrate the popular indignation. Imperial officers were sent to destroy a fine image of Jesus above the bronze gate of Constantinople, which the people regarded with unusual reverence. A ladder was put up and a soldier mounted it to take the figure down. A crowd of women watching the act begged that the image might be given to them. Instead, the soldier struck the figure in the face with a hatchet. The women were enraged, pulled down the ladder, and killed the soldier. The Emperor sent troops to quell the tumult and to carry off the image, and in its place he had a cross set up with these words on it: "The Emperor could not suffer a dumb and lifeless figure of earthly materials, smeared over with paint, to stand as a representative of Christ. He has, therefore, erected here the sign of the cross."[2]

Pope Gregory II., upon receipt of the edict, called

[1] Hefele, iii., 376.
[2] Neander, iii, 213.

a synod at Rome to consider it (726). The synod condemned the Iconoclastic heresy and confirmed the use of images.[1] In 727, the Pope wrote his first letter to the Emperor.[2] It was arrogant and dogmatic, without tact or persuasiveness. It was full of the most ludicrous historical blunders, and gave some fantastic interpretations of the Bible. In it, the Pope justified the use of images, threatened the Emperor with the power of the West, and told him that his portrait, once honoured throughout Italy, had been destroyed everywhere. In the second letter, the Pope plainly told the Emperor: "Doctrines are not the business of the Emperor, but of the bishops." He declared furthermore that the whole world was cursing the Emperor. "The very children mock thee! Go into a school and say 'I am an enemy of images'; the scholars will hurl their tablets at your head."[3] John of Damascus aimed two brilliant and powerful orations at the Emperor in which is found perhaps the best defence of image worship. He declared that the pictures were the "books of the unlearned."[4] The professors of the University at Constantinople declared their opposition to the edict.[5] The inhabitants of Greece used the edict as an occasion for rebellion to secure fiscal and administrative reforms, and even went so far as to proclaim a rival Emperor.

Leo met all this opposition firmly. The Patriarch Germanus was deposed (730) while Anastasius was put

[1] Mansi, xii., 267.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*, No. 41; *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, art. on Leo III.; Mansi, xii., 960.

[3] Mansi, xii., 959; Hefele, iii., 389–404. Milman quotes this letter as the first. ii., bk. 4, ch. 7.

[4] *Orat.*, ii., §10.

[5] Finlay, ii., 36.

in his place, and the various outbreaks were at once subdued with a strong hand. An effort was made to either capture or kill the Pope. The University of Constantinople was closed and the professors arrested; the Greek rebels were defeated and their leaders beheaded; and an effort was made to stop the popular John of Damascus. Leo then promulgated his second edict in 730 for the complete abolition of image worship. Anastasius, the puppet patriarch, at once countersigned the edict, and thus gave it ecclesiastical sanction. In the East it was generally enforced. All images were removed from the churches and burned; the painted walls were whitewashed over; only the cross and the crucifix were left; but still the Iconolatræ were far from being subdued. Meanwhile opposition in the West grew stronger. Gregory III., the last Pontiff to be confirmed in his election by the Eastern Emperor, called a council and excommunicated all Iconoclasts.[1] In revenge, Leo sent a fleet against the Pope, which was wrecked, and also extended the rule of the Patriarch of Constantinople over papal territory in Greece and southern Italy. This action led the Pope to begin negotiations with Charles Martel,[2] and that opened a new chapter in the rise of the mediæval Church and in the world's history.

In 741, Leo was succeeded by his son, Constantine V., only twenty-two years of age, a ruler and general of ability, but of low tastes and vile habits. He became a zealous persecutor of image worship, an idol of the Iconoclasts, and won the victory for their party. His policy was to continue his father's work. Consequently in 754, he called a universal council in

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 42.
[2] *Ibid.*, No. 43.

Constantinople. Although it was the largest assembly ever held up to that time, 338 bishops being present, yet neither the Pope, nor the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem sent representatives. Hence, it was not recognised as œcumenical. The use of images and pictures was condemned as idolatry, and even the crucifix was put under the ban. "The godless art of painting" was proscribed, and the leaders of the image worshippers, Germanus, John of Damascus, and George of Cyprus, were anathematised.[1] Backed up by these measures, the Emperor resolved to root out the evil for ever. All images were ordered destroyed; all pictures were taken out of the Church books; all paintings on the church walls were removed; churches were decorated with trees, fruits, and the chase; transgressors were cruelly punished; and the citizens of Constantinople had to take an oath never again to worship an image.[2]

The contest was renewed under Empress Irene (780–802), a young, beautiful, ambitious, wicked Grecian, who favoured image worship. First, she proclaimed toleration to both parties; then denied it to the Iconoclasts. The highest civil dignities were given to the clergy and monks; and the Patriarch of Constantinople became her prime minister. At their suggestion, no doubt, she called the Council of Nicæa in 787 to undo the work of the Council of Constantinople (754). There were present 375 bishops, and Pope Hadrian sent two representatives, but the three eastern patriarchs were unable to send proxies, so two eastern monks were appointed to sit and vote for all the patri-

[1] The Greek Church regards this as the seventh œcumenical council. Finlay, ii., 57.

[2] Hefele, iii., 421.

archs.[1] The decrees of the Council of Constantinople were nullified because heretical, and the Iconoclasts anathematised. Then image worship was defined and authorised.[2] Many Iconoclastic bishops were induced to renounce their heresy, and were freed from the ban. Finally, an image was brought into the council and fervently and reverently kissed by all present, after which the council adjourned.

Leo the Armenian, who seized the throne in 813, was unfriendly to images. He called a synod of Constantinople in 815 in which the acts of the second Council of Nicæa (787) were nullified. He forbade the lighting of lamps and burning of incense before the images and had them elevated in the churches out of the reach of the people in order to prevent their worship. But Leo's widow, Theodora, restored the usages. Thus, after a long, bitter struggle, images were finally restored in the churches with great pomp and ceremony in 842. The "Festival of Orthodoxy" is still celebrated on February 19th in the Greek Church.

After the great victory had been won for images, both the Latin and the Greek Churches continued their use. The puritanical Iconoclastic Controversy was in a certain sense the forerunner of the ruthless destruction of paintings and statues in England, Holland, and Germany during the Reformation. The Council of Trent passed finally on the doctrine and use of images in the Catholic Church.[3]

As a result of this controversy, the Eastern Church was greatly weakened through dissensions, checked in the growth of its organisation, robbed of its inde-

[1] Neander, iii., 228; Hefele, iii., 460, 549; Schlosser, 279.
[2] Mansi, xiii., 378; Hefele, iii., 486.
[3] Session xxv., Dec., 1563; Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. See *Cath. Encyc.*

pendence, made a mere tool of the state, reformed and purified even though image worship finally prevailed because it was better understood, and compelled to recognise the power of the Pope.

The Western Church, on the other hand, was forced to define the right and wrong use of images and was weakened somewhat by a schism like that in the Eastern Church, because the Frankish Church opposed the worship of images East and West. Pepin had the subject discussed in a synod near Paris (767), in which sat legates from Rome and Constantinople. It was decided that "images of saints made up or painted for the ornament and beauty of churches might be endured, so long as they were not worshipped in an idolatrous manner." Charles the Great, aided by Alcuin, published the Caroline books denouncing all abuses in the worship of images, though tolerating them for ornamentation and devotion.[1] The cross and relics, however, were commended (790).[2] The synod of Frankfort, held in 794, rejected the recommendations of the seventh œcumenical Council of Nicæa and condemned image worship.[3] A synod of Paris in 827 renewed the action of 794.[4] These doctrines were continued by Agobard of Lyons, Claudius, Bishop of Turin, the Waldenses in Piedmont, and the Lollards in England.[5]

Furthermore, the controversy enabled the Pope of Rome to declare his universal supremacy in more

[1] See Smith and Cheetham, art. on "Images," for brief extracts in English; Mombert, ch. 12.

[2] Schaff, iv., §104; Neander, iii., 233; Gieseler, ii., 66; Hefele, iii., 694.

[3] Gieseler, ii., 67; Hardwick, 78.

[4] Mansi, xiv., 415; Hefele, iv., 41.

[5] Schaff, iv., §105.

sweeping terms than ever and to make it good in the West. The rise of the Papacy, as the dominating force in the Church of the West, made the rupture inevitable and permanent. The series of protests in the East against the assumptions of the See of Rome prevented any complete and absolute recognition of the supremacy of the chair of St. Peter. As the years passed, the Eastern Church saw that independence could be secured against the sweeping imperial claims of Rome only by a declaration of total separation. The relations between the East and West were likewise affected in another sense, because they were separated politically when Charles the Great became Emperor of the West (800), and were separated religiously when the allegiance of the Pope was transferred from the eastern authority to the newly created western Emperor.

The growing estrangement between the Greek and Roman Churches, which had its origin in a fundamental difference in character, temperament, and ideas, became conspicuous in the fourth century, reached an incurable stage in the ninth century, and culminated in the eleventh century. Pope Nicholas I. in 863 deposed Photius from the office of Patriarch of Constantinople. Photius, in the counter synod held in 867, returned the compliment by deposing the Pope for heresy and schism.[1]

The gulf between the East and West became practically irreparable when Nicholas I., standing firmly on the Petrine theory and backed up by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, wrote to Emperor Michael:

You affirm that you and your predecessors have been

[1] See Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, iii., 348–423; Milman, bk. v., ch. 4; Neander, iii., 553–586; Gieseler, ii., 216. The Sources are given in Mansi, xvi., and Hardouin, v.–vi.

accustomed to command us and ours; we utterly deny it. . . . The Roman Church encompasses and comprehends within herself, she being in herself the universal church, the mirror and model of that which she embraces within her bosom. Moreover, this vessel was shown to Peter alone, and he alone was commanded to kill and eat; as in like manner, after the resurrection, he alone of all the apostles received the divine command to draw to the shore the net full of fishes. And if unto us he committed that identical commission—which is verily and indeed so committed—to embrace in our paternal arms the whole flock of Christ, is it to be believed that we surrender to you any one of those sheep whom he hath given into our keeping?[1]

In 1054, the Pope excommunicated the patriarch and his whole Church for censuring the faith of Rome. The courtesy was solemnly returned by Constantinople against the Roman Church. Other eastern patriarchs adhered to the See of Constantinople and the rupture was complete. The sack of Constantinople by Latin Christians in the fourth crusade (thirteenth century) widened the breach. At the Council of Lyons, 1274, delegates of the Eastern Empire abjured the schism, by receiving the Nicene Creed with "filioque" in it and by swearing to conform to the Roman faith and to accept the supremacy of the Pope, but the eastern patriarchs refused to do so. When, in 1439 at the Council of Florence, the Eastern Emperor and churchmen signed a compact of reunion, they were induced to acknowledge the Pope as the "successor of Peter the chief of the apostles, and the vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians,

[1] This remarkable letter is given in full in Baronius, ed. by Pagi, ann. 867, note to §4. Parts are translated in Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, iii., 364–371.

to whom plenary power was given by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church." Other differences were patched up. The Pope, for his part, agreed to induce the rulers of the West to go to the defence of the East against the Turks, but failed to make his promise good. The people of the East were sorely disappointed and forced the repudiation of the agreement. In 1453, however, Constantinople fell a prey to the Mohammedan Turks, and the strength of the Eastern Church was broken. In modern times, papal absolutism and eastern stagnation have prevented the reunion.[1]

In conclusion, the differences and resemblances between the Greek and Roman Churches to-day might be stated. The Greek Church rejects the filioque in the Latin creed; repudiates the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary (1854), and denies the infallibility of the Roman Pope (1870). All the clergy are "popes" in the Greek Church and the lower clergy are permitted to marry. The Greek Church gives and the Roman Church withholds the communion wine from the laity. The Greek Church uses leavened, and the Roman Church unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The Greek Church holds to the trine immersion in baptism, repetition of Holy Unction in illness, and infant communion. There is a difference in rites of worship, in language, in art, in architecture, and in the vestments employed. But both hold the fundamentals in the Nicene Creed; both accept all the doctrinal decrees of the seven œcumenical councils from 325 to 787; both practise image worship[2]; both accept

[1] Howard, *Schism between the Orthodox and West. Churches*, Lond., 1892.

[2] The Eastern Church uses only the "icon," a flat representation.

the mediæval doctrine against which the Reformation protested; both believe in tradition and the Bible; both believe in the seven sacraments; both teach transubstantiation; both offer masses for the dead and the living; both sanction priestly absolution; both have three orders of ministry; both are episcopally organised on a hierarchical basis; both have rites and ceremonies that are identical, or at least similar. All things considered, therefore, it seems that the resemblances are far more striking than the differences.

From now on, interest in Church history centres in the Roman Church of western Europe. The undignified quarrel over images gave the Pope an occasion to declare his absolute independence of eastern imperial rule. That fact gave a new bent to the Roman Church, forced upon it a more genuine unity, compelled it to devote all its energies to the great problems in the West, and enabled it to attain its acme under Innocent III. in the thirteenth century. Had the unsatisfactory relationship with the Eastern Church not been severed the history of the mediæval Church in western Europe would have been very different. The separation must be regarded, therefore, as a factor of no small moment in that process. While the effective missionary efforts, having their source and purpose in Rome, were winning all western Europe to a recognition of the Pope's sovereignty, it was very essential that he should completely accomplish his independence of Constantinople so that he would have a free hand to work out the problems of the Western Church.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—See Chapter IX.

2.—John of Damascus, *On Holy Images*, Transl. by M. H. Allies. Lond., 1898. See *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, ix., ch. 11–16.

3.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*. N. Y., 1905.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Bury, I. B., *A History of the Later Rom. Emp.* Lond., 1889. 2 vols.

2.—Finlay, G., *History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires from 716 to 1453*. Lond., 1854.

3.—Hefele, C. J., *History of the Councils*, v., 260. Edinb., 1871–96.

4.—Howard, G. B., *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches*. Lond., 1892.

5.—Neal, J. M., *History of the Holy Eastern Church*. Lond., 1850–73.

6.—Oman, C. W. C., *Story of the Byzantine Empire*. N. Y., 1892.

7.—Stanley, A. P., *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*. Lond., 1883.

8.—Tozer, H. F., *The Church and the Eastern Empire*. N. Y., 1888.

9.—Wells, C. L., *The Age of Charlemagne*. N. Y., 1898.

II.—GENERAL:

Adeney, ch. 9. Alzog, ii., ch. 5, p. 138 *f.*, 322 *f.* Blunt, i., ch. 9. Bouzique, i., ch. 2. Brock, ch. 12–23. Butler, ch. 36, 51, 52, 53. Coxe, Lect. 4, sec. 5. Darras, ii., 310, 324, 464. Döllinger, iii., ch. 2, sec. 2, 3, 8, 9. Fisher, 63, 117, 158. Foulkes, 264 *f.* Gibbon, ch. 49, 60. Gieseler, ii., 172, 199–208. Gilmartin, i., ch. 33. Guericke §37, 73. Hardwick, ch. 7. Hase, sec. 140. Hore, ch. 7, 10, 11. Hurst, i., 510–525. Jennings, i., ch. 8. Kurtz, i., 403–412. Milman, ii., ch. 7–9. Milner, i., 445–446. Moeller, ii., 13–17, 127, 222. Mosheim, bk. 3, cent. 8, pt. 2, ch. 3. Neander, ii., 283–296; iii., 198. Newman, i., 386, 423. Robertson, bk. 3, ch. 4, 7. Schaff, sec. 100–106.

CHAPTER XIV

RELATION OF THE CHURCH AND STATE UP TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

OUTLINE: I.—Church and state before Constantine. II.—Church and state from Constantine to 476. III.—Period of the Ostrogothic rule (476–552). IV.—Reunion of Italy with the Eastern Empire. V.—Alliance between the Papacy and the Franks. VI.—Restoration of the Empire in the West in 800. VII.—Effect of the rise of national states on the Church. VIII.—Sources.

BY the theory of the Roman constitution, the Emperor was not only an autocrat in all political matters, but was also the Pontifex Maximus of religions[1]; consequently, all foreign religions must conform to the constitution or else perish as illegal. The political philosophy of early Christianity in reference to the Roman Empire was not very clearly defined. Jesus taught charity and love, gave the Golden Rule as the law of life, but apparently was indifferent as to civil government. He took no part in political discussions; said "My kingdom is not of this world"; disparaged worldly power and wealth, and advised the rich young man: "Sell all thou hast and give it to the poor." He did recognise the duty of tribute to the state, however, saying "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," but did little more. The Apostles continued the teachings of Jesus, em-

[1] Justinian, *Inst.*, i., ii., 6.

phasised equality and brotherhood; organised the Church on a communistic, democratic basis; and were likewise indifferent to wealth and property. They, too, recognised the state and its essential institutions. Slaves were told to obey their masters.[1] Paul was very particular to explain the obligation of Christians to the state and said: "Let every soul be subjected unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God."[2] He advised the payment of taxes as a just requisition.[3] And he himself, when arrested for disturbing the peace, appealed to Rome.[4] Peter likewise advised Christians to obey "every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him."[5]

The early Church Fathers made no additions to the political science of Jesus and his Apostles. Apparently no questions of seriously conflicting allegiance arose during the whole of the first century. As individuals these early Christians no doubt performed all the duties and paid all the contributions demanded by the Empire. From a strictly legal standpoint, however, the Church was not incorporated among the recognised cults, that is, it was not, like Judaism, a "religio licita." Nevertheless, it was not disturbed for some years.[6] Things must have gone along, for the most part, in a customary manner. Pliny's letter to Trajan (about 111) describes the Christians in Bythinia as law-abiding. With the rapid territorial

[1] Eph. vi., 5; Col. iii., 22; Tit. ii., 9; 1 Pet. ii., 18.

[2] Rom. xiii., 1–7; *cf.* Heb. xiii., 17; 1 Pet. ii., 13.

[3] Rom. xiii., 6–7.

[4] See Tertullian, *Lib. ad Scap.*, for a later recognition of the divine right theory.

[5] 1 Peter ii., 13, 14.

[6] Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 5 and 26.

and numerical increase of Christianity, the state was forced to take cognisance of it and the inevitable conflict occurred. The Christians refused to conform to Roman worship and persecution resulted. Persecution in time produced, on the part of many Christians, a refusal to perform the duties of civil and military service, but it cannot be proved that such hostility was universal. Indeed there is much evidence to show a general disposition to compromise with imperial demands.[1]

With respect to the general duty of obeying the law of the Empire the Fathers of the ante-Constantine period were quite unanimous in their approval. In fact they boasted of their political loyalty and denied all accusations to the contrary. Justin Martyr said that "wherever we are we pay the taxes and the tribute imposed . . . as we were instructed to do by Him," and "while we worship God alone in all other matters, we cheerfully submit ourselves to you, confessing you to be the kings and rulers of men." Irenæus asserted: "we ought to obey powers and earthly authorities, inasmuch as they are constituted not by the devil, but God." These passages, and many others, which are undoubtedly typical, show that it was the persuasion of the Church that conformity was a general obligation. That this fealty was appreciated is seen in the fact that the Church, at least in the time of Emperor Alexander Severus (222), was permitted to own lands, to erect churches, to elect officers openly, and to send officials to court.[2] It was not, however, until 312 that these rights were legalised. One

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 34; c. 42; *De Corona Milit.*, c. 11; *De Idololatria*, c. 17. See Milman, bk. ii., ch. 7.

[2] Milman, ii., 231; Gibbon, ch. 16.

must never lose sight of the fact that it was both very easy and very natural for the clergy and the people to accommodate themselves to the new order of things, and to recognise in these new relationships a reproduction of the theocratic constitution of God's subjects under the old covenant. Indeed it was practically impossible for the masses who came to march under the cross in those days to conceive of a Church without some relation to the state. To-day to a modern man's eyes appears only the antagonism between the Church and state.

There was a most striking contrast, from the standpoint of political science, between the Roman and Christian religions. The Roman Emperor identified religion with the state; Christianity separated God from Cæsar. The Roman religion was restricted to earth; Christianity made the world to come the most important part of life. The Roman religion was only for Romans; Christianity was as wide as the world. Roman paganism fell and the Roman Empire perished, but Roman Christianity, clothed in their form, arose on their ruins to rule the world for more than a thousand years.[1]

Constantine legalised Christianity, but thereby subjected it to the state. He had no idea whatever of surrendering to it any of his autocratic prerogatives. He became virtually the Pontifex Maximus[2] of his new religion by controlling those who performed the sacred rites, and by defining its faith, discipline, organisation, policy, and privileges. He enacted legislation for Christianity just as his predecessors had for paganism. The Church recognised its subjection to the Emperor

[1] Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes.*

[2] The title was used down to the time of Gratian in 380.

without a complaint and permitted him to appoint and depose its officers, to call and dismiss synods and councils, like Arles (314) and Nicæa (325), and almost to replace the Holy Ghost itself in determining the proceedings.[1] This marked a revolution in the relation of the Church to the Empire, for each made a conquest of the other.

It has been customary for Church historians quite generally to characterise the union of the Church and state under Constantine as an unmitigated curse that gave birth to a multitude of evils in the Church which led directly to the Reformation. That contention is one-sided and unfair. Whether the Church and state be regarded as both divine, or both human, or one human and the other divine, the historical fact remains that their union was absolutely necessary and inevitable. When all the forces and factors of the time are carefully and duly considered, it is impossible to conceive of any other solution of the problem in the fourth century.[2] That the union did paganise and materialise the Church no one can deny,[3] but in compensation the Empire was Christianised and spiritualised. The resultant was mediæval Christianity and the ecclesiastical Empire. The Church, without the strength it received from the state, could not have met the barbarians of the North, the Mohammedans of the South, and the heretics within, and successfully conquered the first, held the second in check, and subdued the third. Much of what we enjoy to-day along the lines of culture, law, and religion is due in great measure to that alliance. After the time of Constantine the

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 15.
[2] See Schaff, iii., §13.
[3] *Ibid.*, §22, 23.

Church becomes such a vital and integral part of the life of Europe that history for a thousand years must be viewed through the eyes of the Church and estimated by her standards.

In the two centuries which intervened between the time of Constantine and that of Justinian, imperial legislation directly affecting the Church in all its institutions made rapid progress. The successors of Constantine continued his policy. Imperial sanction was necessary for the validity of every important act in connection with the Church. Councils were called and dismissed in the name of the sovereign, and their proceedings were not valid without his approval. At the Council of Tyre (335), a portion of the bishops appealed to the Emperor's commissioner to settle the dispute about the Arian question, but he declared that the question must be submitted to his imperial master for final decision since it was his province to legislate on all matters concerning the Church.[1] Constantius vetoed a portion of the canons of Remini (360).[2] The Emperors Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. likewise rebuked the Council of Ephesus (431), and dictated its procedure.[3] The Council of Chalcedon (451) was also told to hurry up its work because the imperial commissioners present were needed in state affairs.[4] During this period, however, it is possible to detect pretensions on the part of the Bishop of Rome to the right to call and preside over councils.[5] Here began the conflict over ecclesi-

[1] Harduin, i., 543; Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 13 *ff.*
[2] Cod. Theod., lib. xvi., tit. ii., 1, 15.
[3] Harduin, i., 1538.
[4] *Ib.*, ii., 559.
[5] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 15.

astical sovereignty which was to end in a complete victory for the Roman Church.

The later Emperors similarly exercised the right to decide all disputed points of doctrine, discipline, and elections. They nominated, or at least confirmed, the most influential metropolitans and patriarchs. Thus in 377, the Emperor's representative decided between two rival claimants to the apostolic see of Antioch.[1] Again, the Roman prefect decided between two rival claimants to the chair of St. Peter, Ursinus and Damasus, in favour of the latter, and punished adherents of the former.[2] When rival Popes appealed to Honorius, he appointed a temporary Pope until he could examine into the case. Then he decided in favour of Boniface I. and issued an edict to prevent the recurrence of such a state of affairs.[3] The Emperor was the court of last appeal in all ecclesiastical cases. This was recognised by a council of Rome held by Ambrose in 378, which requested of Emperor Gratian that when a Roman bishop was accused, he might always be tried by the imperial council.[4] The best evidence, however, of the subordination of the spiritual to the temporal authority in this period is found in the legislation. The whole field of Church government and ecclesiastical life and all the relations, duties, morals, and acts of the clergy are covered in the civil laws of the time. Even heresy was put to flight by imperial edict.[5]

[1] Theodoret, v., 3.

[2] Socrates, iv., 29.

[3] Goldast, *Const. Imp.*, iii., 587; Harduin, i., 1238.

[4] Harduin, i., 842.

[5] The laws relating to the Church passed between the time of Constantine and the promulgation of the Theodosian Code in 438 are mostly contained in the sixteenth book of that code. The

During the period of Ostrogothic rule in Italy from 476 to 552, the Roman Church made a few weak efforts to assert her independence. We find, for instance, a Roman synod, held in 502, resolving that no layman has a right to interfere in Church matters. But the Arian Ostrogothic rulers declared that they had succeeded to the Roman Empire's power over the Church. Indeed the Theodosian Code was practically incorporated in the Visigothic Code in 506 by Alaric II. Consequently, Odoacer issued a decree forbidding the alienation of Church property. Theodoric in 498 decided between two rival claimants to the Papacy, Symmachus and Lawrence, giving the former the papal chair and the latter a bishopric.[1] When a synod was called later to try Symmachus (501), it was convened in Theodoric's name. Theodoric even appointed a "visitor" to reform the abuses in the Church. He sent Pope John I. to the eastern Emperor on an embassy, and on his return, dissatisfied with his work, threw him into prison, where he died. Athalaric instructed Pope John II. how to prevent simony in episcopal and papal elections.[2]

Under Justinian the Great (527–565), who by conquest reunited Italy with the eastern Empire in 552, the Popes and the Western Church were again subjected to the eastern rule. Like the Patriarch of Constantinople the Pope was now the nominee of the Emperor and could be removed at the pleasure of the prince. Sylverius, made Pope by the Arian Goth

laws passed between 438 and 534 are found in the Justinian Code which was published in revised form in that year. See Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 16.

[1] Goldast, iii., 95, 615.

[2] Cassiodorus, *Varior.*, ix., 15.

Theodatus, was therefore deposed and exiled by the Emperor's successful general, Belisarius, and a new Pope was chosen. Vigillus, a favourite of the Empress, installed as Pope by Belisarius (537), was peremptorily summoned to Constantinople to answer for his conduct. There a synod was called, and he was excommunicated. His successor, Pelagius I., was apparently appointed directly by the Emperor. Justinian, like Constantine, exercised the right to legislate for every phase of Church life.[1] His theory was that "human and divine authority," that is civic and ecclesiastical law, "combining in one and the same act," formed "one true and perfect law for all."[2] He meant to exercise a spiritual power very much like the temporal power he wielded. Hence he insisted that the election of a Pope in Rome by the clergy, senate, and people should not be valid until confirmed by him. This practically reduced the Pope of Rome to the position of eastern bishops. The organisation of the Church was guarded and regulated.[3] The property of the Church was protected. The jurisdiction of the clergy was clearly defined and minutely regulated as an extension of civil power. In all cases the Emperor was the court of final decision.

This arbitrary interference with the affairs of the Western Church by the imperial authority at Constantinople brought the papal hierarchy to the brink of ruin. The clergy were alarmed at this invasion of the sacred canons of the Council of Chalcedon, and the

[1] These laws are found in the Justinian Code and in the Novellæ, and cover the period from 534 to 565. Excellent translation by Moyle, Oxf. 1889.

[2] Novellæ, 42.

[3] The 134th Novella is a small code in itself.

unity of the Western Church, which had been so strong for several centuries, was seriously threatened. The clergy of Gaul "silently withdrew from, or boldly renounced their communion with Rome; the Illyrian episcopacy prepared to follow their example"; and Africa became defiant.[1] Even the Italian provinces like Venetia and Liguria became disaffected. Pope Pelagius I., indebted to the Emperor for his office, was forced to beg the intervention of the secular arm to compel the ecclesiastical rebels to continue true to their allegiance to the See of Peter. Sorrowful indeed was this spectacle to those who could recall the palmy days of Leo the Great, Felix, Gelasius, and Hormisdas, who had imposed their will on all ecclesiastics, had planted the banner of Roman supremacy in every corner of Christendom, and had even imposed their laws on princes. But it must be remembered that the theory on which Roman leadership rested had not been assailed, and was soon to reassert itself.

In the election of a Pope in 577, the Roman clergy resumed their independence and ventured to consecrate and to inaugurate a successor without even waiting for imperial license. Hence Pelagius II. was the first independently elected Pontiff since the Byzantine conquest of Italy. He reasserted the universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome in a bold tone, and declared that anything done without papal authority was null and void.[2] Meanwhile the disaffection in the West had given way to pronounced loyalty to Rome.

Even Pope Gregory the Great did not question the supremacy of the temporal power. He acknowledged the Emperor as his "earthly master" and said that

[1] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, ii., 163.

[2] Baronius, *Ann.*, 587, §5.

God had given the ruler dominion even over the priesthood.[1] When Emperor Maurice renewed an old edict prohibiting monasteries from receiving soldiers as monks (593), Gregory timidly objected, but quieted his conscience by saying: "What am I but a worm and dust thus to speak to my masters? . . . I have done what was my duty in every particular; I have obeyed the Emperor and have not hushed in silence what I felt to be due to God."[2] He attempted, however to carry out the spirit of the law.[3] But Gregory the Great was willing to compromise the substantial prerogatives of his office. As the subject of the Emperor, he could yield a point. As Pope he stood as firm as a rock, yet was too wise to provoke a disruption which could bring nothing but injury to the unity and power of the Church.

Popes, like patriarchs, were required to keep an "agent" at the eastern court. The Emperors continued to insist on the right to confirm all papal elections, and, of course, this practically put the election into their hands, as is shown by the elevation of so many "agents" to the papal throne, viz., Vigillus, Pelagius I., Gregory the Great, Sabinian, etc. The Popes, on their installation, were expected to pay tribute to the eastern Emperor.[4] Even in questions of doctrine, the Emperor might enforce his will by exiling an obstinate Pope, as in the case of Martin I. (655).

During the period from 552 to 800, the papal power was growing stronger all the time, and only awaited a

[1] Bk. ii., letters 62, 65.

[2] Bk. iii., letter 65. Comp. bk. v., letter 40. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, ii., 233.

[3] Bk. vi., letter 2.

[4] Anastasius, *Biblioth.*, No. 81.

favourable opportunity to issue a declaration of independence. The Italians hated both the Greeks and Lombards as foreign masters. Between the two stood the Pope as the only representative of Italian nationality and the sole champion of Italian independence. The Papacy was in theory democratic, and celibacy made a dynasty impossible. The occasion for a declaration of independence was the Iconoclastic Controversy; the leaders were Gregory II. and Gregory III., who formally excommunicated Emperor Leo and his hierarchy; and the new ally to make the independence good was the family of Pepin in Gaul and Germany. After 772, the papal documents do not bear the name of the eastern Emperor.[1]

The seventh and eighth centuries in European history reveal the elements of religious and political life in a state of incessant and violent fermentation. Sudden changes took place in the relative position of nations. The old Empire was disintegrating and new kingdoms were appearing. During this period of political transformation, the Church was the only system that persisted in the old channel that it had created for itself. The Papacy, though not yet an acknowledged kingdom in the world, still stood among the political powers as a self-existent organisation, exercising an influence over princes and subjects. The governments were isolated, divided, anarchical. In the Church alone was there unity, order, method, organisation, and supreme purpose. There alone was found facility of communication and cordial interchange of views. The Popes of Rome kept up a constant intercourse with all nations from Asia to the Atlantic and constituted the one recognised unifying force in

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 31.

Europe standing for the highest ideals of the age along all lines.

Up to this period the See of Rome had gone far toward establishing an ecclesiastical monarchy. Every principle of an unlimited religious autocracy had been asserted and to a considerable extent established. The outward machinery for this spiritual absolutism had been created and partially put in motion. But many obstacles to the smooth working of the system were still encountered. Chief among these impediments was the strong arm of the eastern Empire. Until the fetters of political dependence were broken, the Papacy could never accomplish its great mission.

Hitherto the Church of Rome had assumed a political headship on many occasions, but it was the result of some accidental emergency and soon disappeared. Nevertheless the experience gained in this exercise of secular authority created an ambition on the part of the Roman Pontiffs for political independence, furnished precedents for future claims, and led the Italians to believe that the head of the Church could give them efficient government in temporal affairs as well as spiritual. The great problem before the successors of St. Peter at this time was how to manage the ecclesiastical ascendency already gained over the Western Church, so as to render it serviceable in securing that political self-existence so essential not only to maintain the ground already won but also to realise their high hopes in other directions. At this juncture a combination of external causes, unparalleled in the world's history, came in to favour the emancipation of the Papacy from the last feeble bonds of a nominal dependency and to permit of the assumption of temporal sovereignty

virtually if not in recognised title. This meant the realisation of the mediæval Church.

Emperor Leo's attempt to abolish the worship of images in Christendom provoked a rebellion in Italy headed by the Pope. Luitprand, seeing his opportunity as King of the Lombards, fell on the exarchate as the champion of images and on Rome as the supposed ally of the Emperor. The Pope, perilously placed between a heretic and an invader, appealed for help to a Catholic chief across the Alps who had just saved Christendom by defeating the Mohammedans on the field of Poitiers. Gregory III. excommunicated the eastern Emperor and begged Charles Martel to hasten to the succour of the Holy Church. Here the Roman Pontiff leads a political revolt against his legitimate sovereign and appeals to a foreign power to make the revolt successful. The Bishop of Rome has stepped into the position of a temporal prince with the political future of Italy in his hands.

The alliance of the Papacy with the Franks marks a new epoch not only in Church history, but in the history of western Europe. These Franks settled in northern France about 250, and began to Germanise the Celtic and Romanic races and institutions found there. But the current of Roman civilisation was so strong that the Franks were swept into it before they realised it. Under Clovis, they were converted directly to Roman Christianity.[1] With the aid of the Roman Christians, he was able to conquer the Arian princes of the western Goths, Burgundians, and Bavarians. He and his successors gave the Church much property, acquiesced in the papal claims, and helped

[1] See Ch. XII.

to extend the papal power throughout the West, though they ruled the bishops and clergy as their vassals.[1] Clovis, himself, convoked synods and enacted Church laws. Later rulers followed these precedents.[2] Thus the way was prepared for a successful alliance between the Frankish ruler and the Papacy.[3]

The house of Pepin was to play an important part in this new arrangement. In 622, Pepin of Laudon, a zealous champion of Christianity, was made mayor of the palace in Austrasia. Pepin of Herstal, grandson of the first Pepin, became in 688 a mayor of the palace for all France (d. 714). He succeeded in making the office hereditary in his family. A series of infant kings[4] made the mayor virtually king. Pepin viewed the Church as a powerful ally, and fostered missionaries. Under him, twenty bishoprics were founded, and the Church secured large territorial possessions.[5]

Charles Martel, after a contest of four years, succeeded to his father's office in 718. He ruled France with the hand of a master, Christianised the Frisians on the north by force, aided Boniface, the apostle of the Germans, defeated the Saracens at the battle of Tours (732), and drove them back into Spain.[6] On the death of Theodoric IV. (737), Charles ruled the Franks directly without setting up another puppet king. Pope Gregory III. in 739 sent him the keys of St. Peter's grave, with the offer of the sovereignty of Rome and Italy in return for aid against the Lombards.[7]

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Christ. Ch. in M. A.*, 54.
[2] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 84–87.
[3] Richter, 36.
[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 120.
[5] Bede, v., 10; Migne, vols. 86–88.
[6] Waitz, iii., 23, note 3.
[7] *Cf.* Thatcher and McNeal, No. 43.

This proffered alliance was refused, but Charles offered to mediate between the Pope and the Lombards.[1] He dealt with Church endowments as with any other part of the roval domain. He gave to his liege Milo the archbishoprics of Rheims and Treves, and to his nephew Hugh the archbishoprics of Rouen, Paris, and Bayeau with several abbeys. When he died in 741, "he divided his kingdom between his sons"—a proof that not only the office of mayor of the palace, but also that of king, had become practically hereditary in his family; yet Charles Martel had never assumed the title of king.

The actual alliance of the Pope with the Franks was consummated with Pepin the Short. The occasion for the compact was the Iconoclastic Controversy in the East, and the change of dynasty in the West. Pepin the Short accepted what Charles Martel had refused. He ruled Neustria, while Carloman, his brother, ruled Austrasia (741–747). When Carloman became a monk (747), Pepin was left as the sole ruler of all France, but still under a phantom Merovingian king. In 751, with the consent of the Franks in their annual assembly, two churchmen were sent to Rome to ask Pope Zacharias, acting in the capacity of an international arbiter, whether the real king ought not to take the name of king. The Pope answered in the affirmative, and thus authorised the usurpation.[2] Thus a new prerogative of the Holy See came into active existence. The next year the assembly of Soissons elected Pepin and his wife King and Queen of France. Childeric III., the Merovingian weakling, was shorn of both his royal hair and his royal crown, and shut up in a monastery.

[1] Richter, i., 200.

[2] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 120; Ogg, *Source Book*, §14; Pertz, i., 136.

Boniface in all probability then anointed the head appointed by the Pope to wear the French crown.[1]

Through this alliance, the Pope expected to make the declaration of independence from the eastern Empire good, to increase and extend papal power in the West, to establish a precedent for deposing and enthroning kings—a significant thing for the future,—and to gain material help against the Arian Lombards who were threatening Rome.[2] In 753, Pope Stephen II., who succeeded Zacharias (752), fled to France from the Lombards to implore aid from Pepin against them. In sack-cloth and ashes, he threw himself at the King's feet and would not rise until his petition was granted.[3] The Pope himself now solemnly anointed Pepin and his family with royal power, at St. Denis, and made him and his two sons patricians of Rome.[4] After that Pepin called himself "by the grace of God, King of the Franks."

Pepin repaid the Pope by making two excursions into Italy against the Lombards. He took an army to Italy in 754, defeated the Pope's enemies, and compelled them to sign a treaty respecting the rights

[1] Ogg, *Source Book*, §14; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 6.

[2] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 122.

[3] Pertz, i., 293; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 44.

[4] *Ib.*, No. 6; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 122; Migne, lxxi., 911. The title of "patrician" was introduced by Constantine. It was the name of a rank, not of an office, and was next to that of Emperor and consul. Hence it was usually conferred upon governors of the first class, and even upon barbarian chiefs whom the Emperor might wish to win. Thus, Odoacer, Theodoric, and Clovis had all received the title from the eastern court. Later it was even given to Mohammedan princes. It was very significant now that the Pope assumed the imperial right to confer it, because it was plainly an illegal usurpation. It made Pepin practically the viceroy of Italy and the protector of the Papacy. (See Smith and Cheatham.)

and territory of the Roman See, but the Franks had scarcely recrossed the Alps before the promises were broken. Pepin, therefore, entered Italy a second time (755), called thither by the famous letter purporting to be from St. Peter himself.[1] The Lombard power was effectually broken. The towns and lands of the exarchate and Romagna, claimed by both the Lombards and the eastern Emperor, were given to the Pope.[2] This is the famous "Donation of Pepin" by which his envoy laid the conquest of twenty-two cities at the shrine of St. Peter, and thus began the temporal power of the Pope.[3] The act of donation is lost.[4] The Pope had owned tracts of land all over the Empire before, but now he becomes through this gift a temporal sovereign over a large part of Italy known as the "Patrimony of St. Peter," or the "States of the Church," which continued until 1870, when it was absorbed into the new kingdom of Italy. This act changed the whole later history of the Papacy[5] and provoked a long controversy with the secular powers of Europe. Pepin continued to labour to build up the Church in France by restoring confiscated Church property,[6] by undertaking needed reforms in discipline and organisation,[7] and by giving material assistance and valuable relics to many religious foundations.

This alliance between the most powerful representa-

[1] Migne, lxxxix., 1004; see Robinson, *Readings*, i., 122; Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, iii., 388.

[2] Muratori, iii., 96; Migne, cxxviii., 1098.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 45. (Baronius, *Ann.*, 755; Migne, cxxviii, 1099.) See Wiltsch, *Geog. and Statistics of the Ch.*, i., 264.

[4] Gibbon, ch. 59.

[5] See "Donation of Constantine" in Henderson, 319.

[6] Waitz, iii., 364.

[7] Pertz, *Leg.*, i., 24; Mansi, xii.; Migne, xcvi., 1501.

tive of the Germanic world and the leader of Roman Christendom in the West was one of the most eventful coalitions in the history of Europe.[1] It was the event upon which all mediæval history turned. It created a new political organisation in western Europe with the Pope and German Emperor at the head. For centuries, it affected every institution in western Europe. After Pepin, each new Pope sent a delegation with the key and flag of Rome and the key of St. Peter's tomb to the Frankish rulers for confirmation of the election and to give the king the oath of allegiance. Thus, the strongest western king assumed the same prerogative over the Church which the eastern Emperor had exercised. Pepin's policy was followed by Charles the Great, the German Emperors, the Austrian Emperors, Napoleon the Great, and Napoleon III.

The next important step in the relations between Church and state was the restoration of the Roman Empire in the West in 800 by Charles the Great,[2] the son of Pepin. Charles was born in 742, and received the education of a warrior. At the age of twelve, he was anointed king, with his father and brother, by Pope Stephen II. (754). As a boy, he participated in military expeditions and gained considerable renown for his ability, his independence, and his prowess. When his father died in 768, he ruled jointly with his brother Carloman, whom he apparently hated very bitterly, and with whom he quarrelled continually, until 771, when Carloman died and Charles assumed his rule as King of all the Franks.

The first problem which engaged his attention was to strengthen and extend his kingdom. This he

[1] Adams, *Mediæval Civilisation*, 127.

[2] The best account of Charles the Great in English is Mombert's.

accomplished by almost incessant military expeditions, of which he made fifty-three. His domain was extended north, east, and south. The Bretons were subdued on the north; the Saxons on the east were conquered after cruelly murdering 4000 prisoners, laying waste their land with fire and sword, and transplanting 10,000 families elsewhere in Germany and in Gaul.[1] The Slavs beyond the Saxons,[2] the Bavarians in the south-east, the Saracens and Basques in the south,[3] the Avars in Pannonia,[4] and the Lombards in Italy, were all subjugated. The result of this military activity was that Charles ruled over France, nearly all of Italy, a large part of Germany, Holland and Belgium, and a corner of Spain. Then by shrewd marriage alliances, he cemented these conquests. He married his dukes and counts to the princesses of powerful lords and kings, and he personally took as his wife, in turn, a Lombard, a Swabian, an east Frankish, an Alemannian princess, and even proposed marriage to the eastern Empress. He assumed the crown of Lombardy in 773. All parts of this vast realm were held together by a complete system of royal laws regulating the whole life of his people even in the minutest details.[5]

Charles, as "Patrician of Rome," was no less active in religious lines. He inherited the alliance with the Papacy and continued it. He protected the Church against the Saracens in Spain, the pagans to the north and east, the Arian Lombards in Italy, and the eastern Emperors. After freeing the Papacy from

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 129; Ogg, *Source Book*, §16, 17. See Mombert, ch. 3, 4.

[2] Mombert, ch. 11.

[3] *Ibid.*, ch. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, ch. 7.

[5] See Waitz. Ogg, *Source Book*, §18, 19.

the Lombards in 774, 781, and 799, he renewed the "Donation of Pepin" and made some valuable additions.[1] He viewed the Pope, however, as merely the chief bishop in his realm. In 796 Pope Leo III. sent him the key and flag of Rome and the key of St. Peter's tomb as tokens of submission; and three years later the same Pope fled to Charles for safety and succour. He reformed and reorganised the Church in his kingdom and made himself its real head. He carried on the missionary labours of Boniface by converting the Saxons at the sword's point, and by forcing Christianity upon the Avars. He preached to the whole hierarchy, held Church councils, and even admonished the Pope. He refused to champion the Pope's cause in the Iconoclastic Controversy, but took a sane middle ground with a leaning toward iconoclasm. In a council at Frankfort, he presided, and had the council legislate on discipline and even on dogma (794).[2]

The career of Charles as Emperor of the Roman Empire in the West (800–814) must now be considered.[3]

Many causes seemed to be operating to open up this new field for his masterly ability. A woman, having put out the eyes of her son, was ruling in the East, contrary to the Roman constitution. Charles had carved out an Empire with his sword and was undisputed master of the West. He was the recognised Emperor in power, if not in name. He had become the defender of the Church and the protector of the Pope. To assume the imperial crown was not

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 46; Wiltsch, *Geog. and Statistics of the Ch.*, i., 265; Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, ii., 415.

[2] See Thatcher and McNeal, No. 47.

[3] Döllinger, *Empire of Charles the Great.*

nearly so radical or unnatural an act, then, as it might seem. In 799, when Pope Leo III. fled from the Roman mob to Charles at Paderborn, Charles gave him royal entertainment, promised aid, notified his Frankish diet of his intentions (Aug., 800), crossed the Alps with an army, and entered Rome in joyous triumph (Nov., 800).[1] There he held a solemn synod in St. Peter's to investigate the causes of the riot which had driven the Pope out, and also the charges made against him. The Pontiff was freed of all guilt.[2]

The reward for Charles's friendly protection soon came. On Christmas eve, 800, while he was kneeling in prayer before the altar of St. Peter, the Church being crowded with the clergy, soldiers, and common people, the Pope suddenly put a golden crown upon the king's head, while the Romans shouted: "To Charles Augustus, crowned by God, great and pacific Emperor of the Romans, life and victory." The Pope then adored him as Emperor Augustus by bowing the knee as his first subject. The drama was concluded by anointing Charles and his son Pepin with the sacred oil.[3]

Whether or not this was a surprise to Charles is a disputed question. He pretended to be greatly surprised, even angered, at the Pope's trick, and declared that he would not have gone to Church had he known of it.[4] There seems to be little doubt about its being premeditated by the Pope. The probability is that no surprise was ever more carefully prearranged on both sides. It is easy to imagine the possibility

[1] *Cf.* Thatcher and McNeal, No. 48.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 49. Robinson, *Readings*, i., 131.

[3] *Ibid.*, i., 134. Thatcher and McNeal, No. 48; Ogg, *Source Book*, §20; Mombert, ch. 14.

[4] Eginhard, §28.

of its being planned out at Paderborn over the wine cups and venison stews. It was very clearly a fine piece of acting on the part of both the Pope and the king. Certainly every act of the two men for some time previous pointed directly and unmistakably to that result.[1] If we can believe Charles's own repeated assertions, the exact time and manner may have been unknown to him, but for years, perhaps as early as 785, Charles had spoken of the possibility. Alcuin, the great confidant of Charles in educational and religious matters, knew of the plan before 800. It had naturally often been suggested to the king by his own officers and nobles and most likely urged by the Popes themselves.[2] In fact the history of both the Frankish dynasty and the Papacy for some years had been steadily tending to this result as a climax.

The coronation itself was significant for many reasons. Constitutionally it made the Pope and Charles traitors to the eastern Emperor. Charles apparently realised this, and, again being a widower, proposed marrying Irene, the eastern Empress, in order to unite the two parts of the Empire and thus avoid trouble.[3] But so frequently had the Pope and the Romans broken their allegiance to the East, that this act was not generally viewed as a rebellion. Furthermore, they assumed that they stood upon the lofty ground of right in making the transfer. Henceforth, in the western lists of Emperors, Charles was made to follow Constantine VI. as the sixty-eighth successor of the first Roman Cæsar.[4]

[1] Muratori, ii., 312; Waitz, iii., 174, note.
[2] Döllinger, *Empire of Charles the Great.*
[3] See Thatcher and McNeal, No. 13, 14. Bryce, 61–62.
[4] Waitz, iii., 184, note.

In 812, the eastern Emperor was induced to recognise his western brother's imperial title. The old Roman Empire was now restored in the West on a Germanic rather than a Roman basis, a fact which revealed the new and decisive Germanic element in the West. Both the Emperor and the Pope were benefited beyond measurement by the change, and it is difficult to say which the more. A Frankish ruler and his family had become the successors of the Cæsars. The Pope assumed that he had created the Emperor and henceforth insisted upon the necessity of papal consecration to the validity of imperial power.[1] The Pope had received a powerful defender and a master who laboured unceasingly to build up the Church. The foundation was laid for the two rival theories of the relation of Church and state, viz., the papal theory and the imperial theory. Henceforth, both Pope and Emperor have a new meaning and a different career. A new chapter in mediæval history and in European civilisation was introduced. Christmas 800 "was the most important day for the next thousand years of the world's history."[2]

The results of the rule of Charles as Emperor (800–814) will now be considered:

1. *Religious.* As Emperor, Charles regarded himself, like the early Cæsars, as the head of the Church. Hence he spent the winter of 800–801 in settling religious affairs in Italy. He insisted on rigid obedience in the hierarchy and the subjection of all ecclesiastical authority to the imperial will. "The Church had to obey him, not he the Church." The Pope was his chief

[1] Ludwig II. was led to admit that right in 871. Thatcher and McNeal, No. 51, 52.

[2] Döllinger, *Empire of Charles the Great.*

bishop in his capital city, but always treated with filial respect and consideration. The bishops were his sworn vassals, like counts. The appellate power of Rome was never once used during his rule. He held the appointment of the higher clergy in his own hands, though after 803, he permitted the appearance of a popular election.[1] He issued edicts on Church matters with as much authority as in purely secular affairs. In fact, in his laws the political and religious are so blended that they can hardly be separated.[2] His conception of the relation of the Church and state has played a vital part in the history of Europe down to the present time. That relationship was stated by Charles in these words: "It is my bounden duty, by the help of the divine compassion, everywhere to defend outwardly by arms the Holy Church of Christ against every attack of the heathen and every devastation caused by unbelievers, and inwardly to defend it by the recognition of the general faith. But it is your duty, Holy Father, to raise your hands to God, as Moses did, and to support my military services by your prayers."[3] It is very evident that in his mind the old Roman idea of the relation of Church and Empire was dominant. The connection of Church and state, which Constantine founded, he established on a firmer basis. The initiative and decision of all ecclesiastical cases were in his hands.[4] He called Church councils and presided over them just as he summoned his privy council. The council of Arles (813) sent him its canons to be changed

[1] Gratian, *Decret.*, Dist. 63, Can. 22; Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 81, 89, 90.

[2] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 63.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 47.

[4] *Hincmari Inst. Reg.*, ch. 34 and 35.

and ratified at will.[1] Discipline, faith, and doctrine all came within his jurisdiction. He even put *filioque* into the Nicene Creed against the Pope's remonstrances (809).[2] In short, he organised, systematised, and controlled the Church in all its branches as a necessary part of his theocracy.[3] He ruled as a David, or a Josiah rather than an Augustus or a Constantine. Churchmen of ability held seats in the civil assemblies and were given important political positions. The Church was forced to contribute soldiers and money to maintain the Empire,[4] although the clergy themselves in 801 were forbidden to participate in military life. At the same time, he gave the Church for the first time the legal right to collect tithes, bestowed rich gifts, and endowed monasteries, splendid churches and cathedrals. No wonder a satirical priest complained that the power of Peter was confined to heaven, while the Church militant was the property of the king of the Franks.

The Pope and clergy gladly acquiesced in the usurpation of Charles as they did in that of Constantine and even gave him the papal title of "Bishop of Bishops" and "David." The grateful Pope Adrian in a council of fifty-three bishops gave him the right to name successors for the Holy See.[5] This was little more, however, than the transference to Charles of a right exercised by all the eastern Emperors. Stephen IV. decreed that no Pope could be elected save in the presence of imperial delegates (815).[6]

[1] Harduin, iv., 1006.

[2] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 64–65.

[3] Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, 65.

[4] Ogg, *Source Book*, § 22; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 136.

[5] This is now regarded by some authorities as a forgery. Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*

[6] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 38; Gratian, *Decret.*, Dist. 63, Can. 28.

Pope Paschal III. had the great patron of the Church canonised. Even the Patriarch of Jerusalem recognised him as the head of Christendom and sent him the keys of the Holy Sepulchre on Mount Calvary and the flag of the city.[1]

2. *Political.* Charles clearly differentiated between his office as king and as Emperor. In recognition of his new dignity, he laid aside his German royal costume, and donned the Roman imperial tunic, chlamys, and sandals.[2] He ordered that "every man in his whole realm be he clergyman or be he layman, shall renew to him as Emperor the vow of fidelity previously taken to him as king," and that "those who have not yet taken the former vow, shall now do likewise, even down to boys twelve years of age" (802).[3] Rome was the capital of his Empire; Aachen, of his German kingdom. He divided his Empire among his three sons as kings, but the death of two of them left Louis both king and Emperor.[4] The Empire which he carved out with the sword was now unified and ruled by imperial law instead of tradition and custom. His Empire embraced all western continental Europe except central and southern Spain and southern Italy. It included Germans as well as Romans, Slavs, Celts, and Greeks, and was held together by an imperial army.[5] It united the Teutonic civilisation with the Romanic on a Christian basis. It was divided into twenty-two archbishoprics.

Charles, as the new Constantine of the West, was the

[1] *Ann. Laur.*, 188.
[2] Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christ.*, ii., 459.
[3] Emerton, *Med. Europe*, 7; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 140.
[4] Charta Divisionis, 806.
[5] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 135–137.

absolute sovereign of this realm. His laws covered every detail in the whole life of his people.[1] Bishops were forbidden to keep falcons; nuns must not write love letters; the kind of altar pieces used in Churches was specified; priests were not to wear shoes in divine services. A pure life was ordered for monks. Instructions were given to farmers for feeding hens and roosters; the kind of apples to be grown was prescribed; wine-presses and not feet-presses were to be used. Even the prices of food and of clothes were regulated by law—a fur coat, it was decreed, should sell for thirty shillings, a cloth coat for ten shillings.[2] The Empire was divided into districts and marks, ruled over by imperial "missi" and counts, who executed their master's will.[3] Yet notwithstanding these magnificent and successful efforts to thwart the Teutonic tendencies to localisation, each tribe was permitted to retain its own laws, its hereditary chiefs, and its free popular assemblies of freemen.

Charles never recognised the validity of the papal theory of the right of the Pope to crown and depose kings by virtue of his own coronation in 800. When he associated his son Louis with him in rule (813), Louis entered the Church with the king's crown already upon his head. Charles then ordered him to take the royal crown off and put on an imperial crown which lay on the Church altar. Neither the Pope's presence nor his sanction was asked. After Charles's death, however, the Pope carried the crown of Constantine to Germany and coronated Louis with it (816), and,

[1] *Translations and Reprints*,? Henderson, 189.

[2] Lecky, ii., 259.

[3] Ogg, *Source Book*, § 21; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 9; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 139.

before that time, his biographer does not call him Emperor.[1]

3. *Educational.* The reign of Charles the Great stands out as the sun between the intellectual night that preceded and the daylight that followed his rule.[2] He employed the Church as the best means for furthering the education of his Empire. The clergy and monks became the teachers and writers; the monasteries and churches were used as the seats of learning—the schoolrooms and schoolhouses. He issued important educational laws which practically created a very crude public school system and required all boys to have a general elementary education. His purpose was to make good Christians and good subjects.[3] The centre of his whole educational system was his famous "Court School," the very heart of Christian culture in Europe. In it, called from every section, were the leading scholars, divines, poets and historians of Europe. In addition to helping to educate the young princes of the country, they engaged in important literary activities. They compiled a German grammar, collected old German songs and minstrels, corrected the Latin Bible, wrote the Caroline books, collected manuscripts, revived the classics, and studied the Church Fathers.[4]

A careful analysis of the character of Charles the Great shows that he was a sincere Christian and faithful churchgoer, a great almsgiver and very kind to the poor, and a man who devoted his life to the upbuilding

[1] Eginhard, *Ann.*, 813. Read the case of Louis and Lothair 817 Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 42.

[2] Ogg, *Source Book*, §23; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 10, 11, 12.

[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 144, 145; *Transl. and Reprints;* Mullinger, *Schools of Charles the Great.*

[4] Mombert, ch. 10.

of a Christian civilisation.[1] Yet he was guilty of deeds which a higher conception of Christian morals condemns as un-Christian. He sacrificed thousands of lives to his passions and ambitions; for thirty years he waged a war of extermination against the Saxons and murdered more than 4000 prisoners in cold blood. Like Mohammed, he made his motto, submission to Christianity or death. Christians of that day, for the most part, pronounced his policy right, although some of the greatest, like Alcuin, denounced it. He had nine wives and concubines, and, like Henry VIII. of England, had little conscience in disposing of them. He was not highly cultured, yet he spoke Latin with ease and knew some Greek. When an old man, he learned to write and deserves great credit for the manner in which he encouraged education. He cultivated the society of the most cultured men in Europe and from them imbibed much. At meals he had read the heroic deeds of his ancestors, or some work of the Church Fathers like Augustine's *City of God*. As a warrior and statesman, only Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, and Constantine before his day can be compared with him. He was the first and greatest of all the German Emperors. Since his time, only Otto the Great, Peter the Great, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon the Great, have any claim to rank as his peers. The Moses of the Middle Ages, he left an indelible stamp of his genius on Germany and France, continues to be the only common hero of both of these great nations, and through them modified the whole western world.[2]

[1] Ogg, *Source Book*, §15; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 7; Mombert, ch. 6.

[2] See Eginhard for the best pen picture of the personal appear-

Eight years before his death, Charles the Great made his three sons kings.[1] This act would have proved fatal to the Empire. Charles must have known from the writings of Gregory of Tours, the dangers of such an arrangement. The division made among his sons was unnatural, because it lacked unity in race and territory, but the death of Charles and Pepin, the eldest and second sons, prevented imperial suicide. Charles the Great then solemnly crowned the surviving son, Louis, as Emperor in 813. Louis the Pious (814–840) sought to preserve both the Carolingian practice of division and the integrity of the Empire. At Aachen, in 817, to prevent the Empire's being "broken by man lest thereby a scandal, to the Holy Church might arise," Louis made his eldest son, Lothair, co-Emperor, and, with the consent of the people, crowned him.[2] The younger sons were made kings but *sub seniore fratre*. Their territorial districts were clearly defined and elaborate instructions were given about their various relations.[3] In 819, Louis married again and soon a fourth son, Charles the Bald, appeared to complicate matters (823). Louis then made a new division of the Empire in order to provide for the new claimant.[4] A long list of territorial changes, and disgraceful, ruinous, internecine wars resulted.

Louis the Pious died in 840, and was succeeded by

---

ance and habits of this wonderful man. Robinson, *Readings*, i., 126.

[1] Louis, the youngest, had Aquataine, Gascony, Septimania, Provence, and a part of Burgundy. Pepin, the second son, had Italy, Bavaria, Almania, and a part of the Alpine country. Charles, the eldest, received all the rest—old France, Thuringia, Saxony, and Frisia.

[2] Henderson, 201.

[3] Emerton, 18, 19.

[4] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 50.

Lothair as sole Emperor. His brothers, Louis and Charles (Pepin was now dead), rebelled against him and forced him to restrict his possessions to Italy and a narrow strip running from Italy to the North Sea (843). But Lothair, tired of the cares of this life retired to a monastery in 855 after dividing his imperial territory among his three sons.

As a result of the Carolingian policy of division, the Empire so skilfully constructed by Charles the Great, was almost destroyed. Division of rule meant division of resources. The successors of Charles the Great were men of inferior ability. His son, Louis the Pious, was a weak, easily influenced ruler and completely under the thumbs of the clergy. He made some noble efforts to reform the court, but only aroused the enmity of the aristocracy. Lothair, Louis II., and Charles the Bald were Emperors of as short-sighted a policy and of as little ability. Civil wars were almost incessant; nobles held in subjection by the great Charles reasserted their independence; the Northmen,[1] Slavs, Hungarians[2] and Saracens began to make disastrous inroads; imperial laws were disregarded; and by the end of the ninth century, the Empire of Charles the Great was little more than an empty title hardly worth fighting for.[3]

Another significant result of the decline of the Carolingian Empire was the rise of modern states. By the treaty of Verdun in 843.[4] Louis the German (d. 876) was given Germany east of the Rhine; Charles

[1] Ogg, *Source Book*, §27; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 15, 20; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 150–155, 157, 163.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 21.

[3] Ogg, *Source Book*, §26, 28; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 158.

[4] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 17, 18; Ogg, *Source Book*, §25.

the Bald (d. 877) received what is approximately France of to-day; and Lothair as Emperor (d. 855) was left Italy and a narrow strip to the North Sea with the two capitals in it. To confirm the treaty of Verdun, Louis and Charles with their followers, took the famous Strassburg oaths.[1] Louis and the French army took the oath in Latin; Charles and the Germans took it in German; and this is the first recognition in Europe of differences of race and language as a basis for political action.[2] The treaty of Meersen[3] in 870 completed the separation of Italy, Germany, and France by dividing the "strip of trouble" given to Lothair in 843. Here was the beginning of mediæval and modern France, Germany, and Italy. The Carolingian Empire virtually ended with Charles the Fat (888). Disintegration soon divided Europe among a multitude of petty feudal sovereigns with warring policies and interests.[4]

Ecclesiastically, the Papacy was immediately strengthened. The supremacy of the state over the Church, which Charles the Great established and which Louis the Pious had inherited, but did not use to much advantage,[5] was removed. This

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 16; Ogg, *Source Book*, §24; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 433.

[2] Emerton, *Med. Europe*, 26–28.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 19.

[4] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 22, 23, 24, 25.

[5] He did insist, however, upon his dominion over Rome and over the Pope as his vassal. Pope Stephen IV. at once caused the Romans to swear fealty to the Emperor and ordained that the consecration of the Pope must take place in the presence of the imperial ambassadors. His son Lothair was crowned Emperor in Rome and repeatedly repaired thither to protect the Holy See. Another son, Louis, was also anointed king by Pope Sergius in Rome. This act strengthened the papal claim to control elections to secular

release from secular control furnished an excellent occasion and opportunity for the rapid growth of the papal theory which culminated in the lofty claim of Pope Nicholas I. to independence of imperial control and supremacy over it. Again and again the Pope was called upon to act as arbitrator in the disputes and wars. The power of bishops and metropolitans was likewise increased and for a similar reason, but the general decline in civilisation carried the Church inevitably with it. The anarchy and confusion which resulted, formed an excellent cover for the promulgation of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. Ultimately the Papacy was weakened by the decline of the Empire and the rise of national states, because there was a tendency to create national churches and to set up kings who questioned the Pope's claim to political supremacy. Indirectly it led to the Protestant Revolution.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—*New Testament.*
2.—*New Testament Apocrypha.*
3.—The Church Fathers. See Chap. X.
4.—Henderson, *Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* Bohn. Lib.
5.—Univ of Penn., *Translations and Reprints,* iv., No. 1, 2; v., 4, 5.
6.—Eginhard, *Life of Charles the Great.* Tr. by S. E. Turner. N. Y., 1880.
7.—Robinson, *Readings in European History,* vol. i.
8.—Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book for Mediæval History.*

power. In 871 Louis II. acknowledged his divine right to imperial rule to be derived from papal sanction. Another step was taken when the council of Aix-la-Chapelle deposed Emperor Lothair (842).

9.—Ogg, *Source Book of Mediæval History.*
10.—*Theodosian Code.*
11.—*Justinian Code.*

Bibliographical Note:—Nearly all the important sources for a study of this subject are in Latin. Among them are, Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum;* Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum; Corpus Juris Canonici; Corpus Juris Civilis;* Pertz, *Monumenta Historica Germania;* Niebuhr, *Corpus Byzantinæ;* Migne, *Patrologia;* Potthast, *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Ævi.*

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Allies, T. W., *Church and State as Seen in the Formation of Christendom.* Lond., 1882.
2.—Armitage, W., *Sketches of the Church and State in the First Eight Centuries.* Lond., 1888.
3.—Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire.* Var. eds.
4.—Bury, J. B., *The Later Roman Empire.* Edinb., 1889. 2 vols.
5.—Carr, A., *The Church and the Roman Empire.* Lond., 1887.
6.—Church, R. W., *Relations between Church and State.* Lond., 1881. *Beginnings of the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1895.
7.—Croke, A. D., *History of the Church under the Roman Empire* (to 476). Lond., 1873.
8.—Cutts, E. L., *Charlemagne and His Times.* Lond., 1878. *Union of Church and State.* Lond., 1881.
9.—Emerton, E., *Introduction to the Middle Ages.* Bost., 1888. *Mediæval Europe.* Bost., 1894.
10.—Fisher, H. A. L., *The Mediæval Empire.*
11.—Geffcken, H., *Church and State.* Lond., 1877. 2 vols.
12.—Gibbon, E., *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* Var. eds.
13.—Gierke, O., *Political Theories of the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1900.
14.—Greenwood, A. D., *Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1896.
15.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* Lond., 1859–72. 5 vols.

16.—Gregorovius, F. A., *Rome in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1900.
17.—Gosselin, J. E. A., *Power of the Pope During the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1853.
18.—Hardy, E. G., *Christianity and the Roman Government.* Lond., 1893.
19.—Hodgkin, T., *Italy and Her Invaders.* Oxf., 1892–9. *Charles the Great.* Lond., 1896. *Theodosius.* Oxf., 1889. *Theodoric.* N. Y., 1891.
20.—Hussey, R., *Rise of the Papal Power.* Lond., 1863.
21.—Hergenröther, J. A. G., *The Catholic Church and the Christian State.* Lond., 1876. 2 vols.
22.—James, G. P. R., *History of Charlemagne.* Lond., 1832.
23.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.* Phil., 1869.
24.—Mann, H. K., *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* Lond., 1905.
25.—Manning, H. E., *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.* Lond., 1862.
26.—Mombert, J. I., *History of Charles the Great.* N. Y., 1888.
27.—Oman, C. W. C., *The Dark Ages* (476–918). Lond., 1893.
28.—Pressense, E. de, *History of Church and State.* Lond., 1869.
29.—Tozer, H. F., *The Church and the Eastern Empire.* Lond., 1888.
30.—Wells, C. L., *The Age of Charlemagne.* N. Y., 1897.
31.—Workman, H. B., *Church of the West in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1898.

II.—GENERAL:

Alzog, ii., 92–104, 184. Butler, ch. 30, 31, 55, 56, 57. Chantrel, pd. 3, ch. 1. Cheetham, ch. 9. Crooks, ch. 24, 33. Döllinger, i., ch. 1, sec. 9–10; ii., ch. 5, sec. 1; iii., ch. 4, sec. 1. Dunning, 131–160. Fisher, 161, 168, 244. Gieseler, i., 191–204, 419; ii., 71, 119, 153, 220, 237. Gilmartin, i., ch. 31–32. Guericke, i., sec. 69; Guizot, i., ch. 7–12. Hardwick, ch. 6, sec. 2. Hase, 134–146, 171–173. Hurst, i., 161–

180, 325–341, 410, 427, 473–495. Jennings, i., ch. 6, 8. Kurtz, i., 235–247, 483–488. Leavitt, ch. 1–12. Mahan, bk. 4, ch. 13. Milman, ii., 4, 130, 429; iii., 1–109. Moeller, ii., 1–2, 84–93, 99–108. Mosheim, bk. 3, pt. 2, ch. 2, sec. 7–13. Neander, iii., 1–112, 174–195; v., 117–132, 144. Robertson, i., 294–297, 486, 517; ii., 122–149. Robinson, ch. 4, 6, 7, 8. Schaff, ii., 90; iii., 203–264.

CHAPTER XV

THE PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS AND THE PAPAL CONSTITUTION

OUTLINE: I.—What were the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals? II.—Condition of Europe when the Decretals appeared. III.—Purpose of the forgery. IV.—Character and composition. V.—Time, place, and personality, of authorship. VI.—Significance and results. VII.—Nicholas I. and papal supremacy. VIII.—Decline of spirituality in the Church. IX.—Sources.

THE Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals[1] were a curious collection of documents, both genuine and forged, which appeared in western Europe about the middle of the ninth century under the name of Isidore Mercator, to give the Church a definite, written constitution. They were a stupendous forgery —the most audacious and pious fraud ever perpetrated in the history of the Church—worked out with admirable skill and consummate ingeniousness. Forgery was a common thing in those days, and it was generally believed that all things which upheld the doctrines and prerogatives of the Church of God were allowable.[2]

When these false letters appeared, the Empire of Charles was falling to pieces under his wrangling

[1] A decretal, in the strict canonical sense, is an authoritative rescript of a Pope given in reply to some question propounded to him, just as a decree is an ordinance enacted by him, with the advice of his clergy, but not drawn from him by previous inquiry. See Gieseler, pd. 2, ch. 3; *Cath. Encyc.*

[2] Janus, *The Pope and the Council;* Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 46.

grandsons. Anarchy and confusion were rampant; might was the only recognised law. Feudalism with its decentralising influences was rapidly prevailing throughout Europe. The Church also reflected this sad state of affairs. The Pope was reduced to a vassal of the Emperor. Metropolitans were in league with the political rulers and even helped to plunder the bishoprics and oppress the priests. The bishops were masterly secular princes and landed nobles; hence their persons had lost their sanctity, and they were persecuted by their archbishops and robbed by their sovereigns. The Bishop of Lyons wrote: "No condition of man whether free or unfree is so insecure in the possession of his property as the priest. . . . Not only the estates of the Church, but even the churches themselves are sold." The lower clergy suffered from the tyranny and lawlessness of the day; the laity were similarly demoralised. The synod of Aachen in 836 protested against the contempt into which the clergy had fallen with the ungodly laity. The age, too, was not critical. In fact, it was an impious thing to disbelieve anything connected with the Bible, the Church, or with sacred tradition. It was an era of superstitions and legends. No period, therefore could have been better adapted than that for the promulgation of such a magnificent system of fabrications.

There are divergent theories as to the purpose of these falsified epistles: (1) Some maintain that the sole object was to give the Church a constitution of a definite form and character. (2) Others hold that the intention was to present unquestionable proof of the papal theory of supremacy by filling in the fatal gap between the time of Jesus and Constantine. It was dangerous to make the origin of the Church dependent

upon an Emperor's fiat; hence, it was necessary to elevate the See of Rome by clothing the Pope with antiquity, spiritual majesty, and supreme authority.[1] Venerable Rome was made to furnish the necessary documents from St. Peter onward to supplement the Bible and the Church Fathers with manufactured tradition. (3) Still others assert that the object was to give the Church a general code of discipline in the anarchy and confusion of the time.[2] (4) Most scholars believe, however, that the real motive was to free the bishops from their dependence upon the state, upon the metropolitans, and upon the provincial synods which were under the control of the rulers.[3]

The motive for the publication of this code of decretals is thus stated by the authors themselves:

> Many good Christians are reduced to silence, and compelled to bear the sins of others against their own better knowledge, because they are unprovided with documents by which they might convince ecclesiastical judges of the truth of what they know to be the law; seeing that though what they allege may be altogether right, yet it is not heeded by the judges unless it be confirmed by written documents, or by recorded decisions, or made to appear in the course of some known judicial proceeding.

The object of the compilation may be found also in these words:

> We have likewise inserted the decretal epistles of certain apostolic men—that is, of Clement, Anacletus, Evaristus, and others who are their successors, indeed as many as we have been able to find, down to Pope Sylvester; after these

[1] Theiner.
[2] Moehler.
[3] Kunst, Wasserschleben, Döllinger, Moeller, Hatch.

we have annexed the rest of the decretals of the Roman prelates down to Gregory the Great, together with certain epistles of that pontiff; in all which, by virtue of the dignity of the Apostolic See, resides an authority equal to that of the councils; so that, the discipline of the ecclesiastical order being thus by our labours reduced and digested into one body of law, the holy bishops may be instructed in the entire "rule of the fathers"; and thus obedient ministers and people may be imbued with spiritual precedents, and be no longer deceived by the practices of the wicked. For there are many who by reason of their wickedness and cupidity bring accusations against the priests of the Lord, to their great oppression and ruin. Therefore the Holy Fathers did institute laws, which they called holy canons, which, however, the evil-minded have often made the instruments of unjust charges, or even possessed themselves of the goods of the innocent.

The canons were insufficient to meet the evils of the day. Some remedy must be found of equal if not greater authority. The decretals of the Roman Pontiffs were seized for this holy purpose. Many such decretals were known to the Church. But there was a fatal hiatus of two centuries and a half after the founding of the See of Peter. That chasm must be bridged over by documents which would prove that the divine headship of Peter was consciously exercised by all his successors. With such indisputable evidence the supremacy of Rome would be established beyond question, and the entire hierarchy would be benefited. The ascendancy of the Church over the state would be established. Papal sovereignty would be acknowledged. Episcopal independence of secular control would be secured.

The sources of the Isidorian Decretals, now satis-

factorily determined, were: the writings of the Church Fathers, particularly Rufinus (d. 410); the works of Cassiodorus (b. 470); Jerome's Vulgate; the *Liber Pontificales;* the general theological literature down to the ninth century; various collections of laws like *Breviarium Alaricianum*, the *Lex Visigothorum*, and the Frankish capitularies; the genuine archives of the Church like papal letters and decretals, Church canons, and minutes of Church councils; the correspondence of Archbishop Boniface (d. 754); and the forgeries.

Before this collection appeared there had been several others formed in the Western Church:[1]

1. Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian, who lived at Rome as a monk in the sixth century, made a collection of the fifty Apostolic Canons; decrees of the Eastern and African Church councils from 375 to 451; and letters of Popes from 314 to 498. This collection was used by Charles the Great as a basis in part for the Frankish laws.

2. Isidore of Seville, early in the seventh century, made a second collection, very much like the first one just described.

3. Then Isidore Mercator, about the middle of the ninth century put out a third collection which embraced those by Exiguus and Isidore of Seville and included all the forgeries. This last collection opens with a preface, then has a spurious letter from Aurelius to Damasus, and a forged answer; a selection from the fourth council of Toledo; a list of councils; and two spurious letters from Jerome to Damasus, with replies. After these documents the collection proper begins. It consists of three parts. The first includes the fifty

[1] Other collections had been made in the East. See Smith and Cheetham, art. on "Canon Law."

Apostolic Canons; fifty-nine spurious decretals from Clement to Melchiades (90–314); a treatise *On the Primitive Church and the Council of Nicæa;* and the spurious "Donation of Constantine."[1] The second part opens with a genuine quotation from the Spanish collection of the decretals of the Greek, African, Gallic, and Spanish councils down to 683. The third part also begins with a quotation from the *Hispania* and then gives the decretals of the Popes from Sylvester (d. 335) to Gregory II. (d. 731), of which thirty-five are forged and others contain many interpolations; and, finally, the *Capitula Angilramni.*

Evidences of fraud are to be found in the uniformity of language, the impurity of style, the use of words of a late origin for an earlier period, many clumsy anachronisms, the total absence of all proof of the authenticity of the early decretals, the evident effort to meet contemporary prejudice, and the fact that there is no knowledge of the existence of the forged letters until incorporated in this collection. Many absurdities also appear: for instance, Roman bishops of the second and third centuries write in Frankish Latin of the ninth century in the spirit of post-Nicene orthodoxy and about the mediæval relationship of the Church and state. These early bishops quote the Vulgate of Jerome as amended under Charles the Great. Pope Victor (202) writes a letter to Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria (383) about a second-century controversy. Pope Anacletus speaks of patriarchs, metropolitans, and primates long before they arose. Pope Melchiades, who died in 314, mentions the Nicene Council which was held in 325. Pope Zephyrinus (218) appeals to the laws of Christian Emperors before Constantine was born.

[1] Henderson, 319.

Just how soon they were discovered to be forgeries, is a question that has aroused considerable discussion. Pope Nicholas I. must have known that they were false, but they suited his purpose so well that he sanctioned them. Some of the Latin bishops saw through the forgery, but, for various reasons, kept silent. A few of the Frankish bishops denounced them and objected to their reception as law. Even Hincmar, although he did so much to establish them, declared them to be spurious and called them a "mouse-trap" and a "cup of poison with the brim besmeared with honey." The synod of Rheims in 991 opposed the Isidorian principles. Stephen of Tournai (d. 1203) called them into question. Peter Comester in his *Historia Scholastica* (twelfth century) granted the ingeniousness of the author. Dante alluded to the fiction and grumbled about the "Donation of Constantine" in these words:

> Ah, Constantine! of how much ill the cause—
> Not thy conversion, but those rich domains
> That the first wealthy Pope received of thee.[1]

Nicholas of Cusa questioned their authenticity.[2] Chancellor Gerson of the University of Paris, boldly asserted that the Papacy was founded on fraud.[3] Marsiglio of Padua[4] and Wiclif took the same view. Johannus Turrecrenta was skeptical about them.[5] Erasmus pronounced against them. The authors of the *Magdeburg Centuries* conclusively proved in detail their

[1] *Inferno*, bk. xix., 112–118.
[2] *De Concordia Catholica*, bk. iii., 2.
[3] *De Reform. Eccl.*, c. 5.
[4] *Defensor Pacis*, ii., c. 28.
[5] *Sum. Eccl.*, vol. ii., 101.

fraudulent character. Calvin took the same view,[1] and De Moulin and Le Conte helped to establish the fact of forgery. David Blondel, a Reformed divine, made the exposure unquestionable against the attempted vindication of the Jesuit, Torres. Still since it is so difficult to separate the true from the false, their influence was perpetuated beyond this period. It was not an easy thing for an infallible Church to abandon ground once assumed. The fruits of the forgery could not be surrendered. Catholic and Protestant historians alike now agree, however, that they were for the most part fictitious.

There has been a wide divergency of view as to the place, time, and authorship. A few earlier scholars[2] held that they originated in Rome. This is now rejected by all modern scholars, because their arrival in Rome is almost exactly known. One year Pope Nicholas I. is ignorant of them, the next he asserts their authenticity.[3] They were probably carried to Rome by Rothod in 864.[4] Many contemporaries believed that they came from Spain as the work of Isidore of Seville, but it is generally acknowledged now that they were created in the Frankish Empire because the language swarms with Gallicisms, the style, phrases, and words are of the Frankish period, and the frequent use of the correspondence of Boniface shows that the archives of Mayence were consulted. It is probable that the first collection was made at Mayence, and the later and larger collection may have been made at Rheims.

In matter of time, they seem to have been an

[1] *Institutes*, iv., 7, 11, 20.
[2] Febronius, Eichorn, Theiner, Röstell, Luden.
[3] Mansi, xv., 694.
[4] Kurtz, i., 82.

evolution beginning with the collection of Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, increased by Isidore of Seville in the seventh century, amplified by Isidore Mercator (Pseudo Isidore) with forgeries in the ninth century, and appeared in their final form in the eleventh century.[1] Their frequent contradiction and disregard of well-known history suggests a composition covering years. Some of the forgeries were undoubtedly used by Charles the Great, and the Donation of Constantine is perhaps still older.[2] Passages from the Council of Paris held in 829 are literally quoted, hence the collection by Isidore Mercator must have been made after that date. On the other hand, the collection was used in 857 by the French synod of Chiersy,[3] in 859 by Hincmar of Rheims, and in 865 by Pope Nicholas I.[4] The conclusion can be drawn, then, that the collection of Isidore Mercator must have appeared sometime between 829 and 857. Furthermore, the frequent complaint about ecclesiastical disorders, the deposition of bishops without trial, frivolous divorces, and frequent sacrilege, best fit the period of civil war and confusion among the grandsons of Charles the Great.

There is likewise divergence of opinion as to the authorship. The name of the compiler, Isidore Mercator, led to the early erroneous belief that Isidore of Seville, the eminent canonist, was the author; and, consequently, when the mistake was established, the author was dubbed "Pseudo Isidore," a name used to the present day. Scholars differ widely in their efforts to identify this "Pseudo Isidore" and suggest

[1] Niedner, p. 397.
[2] Hardwick, *Church History*, 148, note.
[3] *Mon. Ger.*, i., 452.
[4] Mansi, xv., 694.

Benedictus Levita, a deacon of Mayence, whose *capitularium* of 847 agrees in certain passages with the decretals[1]; Rathod of Soissons[2]; Otgar, Archbishop of Mayence (d. 847), who led the clerical rebellion against Louis the Pious[3]; Ebo, Archbishop of Rheims, also a clerical rebel against the Emperor[4]; Riculfus,[5] Archbishop of Mayence (784–814); and Aldrich.[6] The authorship, it is apparent, is not established beyond question. Indeed there are many reasons for believing that these documents were the product not of a single individual, but of a joint effort. The constant repetitions, the frequent contradictions, the lack of unity, the differences in style and phrases suggest this conclusion. It is quite probable that the leading churchmen in Germany and France in the middle of the ninth century shared the authorship.[7] Gieseler holds that Riculfus (784–814) brought the genuine Isidorian collections from Spain, that Otgar enlarged and corrupted them at Mayence (826–847), that Benedictus Levita copied them; and this may have been the case.

They were eagerly received by the Church, and for various reasons Pope Nicholas I. (853–867) gave them papal sanction and used them to extend his power. He led the Church to believe that they were among the most venerable and carefully preserved documents of the papal archives. Backed up by them, he asserted his jurisdiction over both East and West; in fact, the whole world. To the eastern Emperor he

1 Blondel, Kunst, Walter, Densiger.
2 Phillips, Gfrörer.
3 Ballareni, Gieseler, Wasserschleben.
4 Weizsäcker, Von Noorden, Hinschius, Richter, Boxman.
5 Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 48.
6 Döllinger.
7 Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 49.

wrote, "We by the power committed to us by our Lord through St. Peter, restore our brother Ignatius to his former station, to his see [at Constantinople], to his dignity as patriarch and to all the honours of his office."[1] At the same time he exalted the power of excommunication and used it to humble both princes and prelates; he forced Lothair II. to restore his divorced wife; he humbled the great Hincmar by reinstating the deposed Bishop Rathod of Soissons; he subjected both metropolitans and bishops to his rule; he deposed the archbishops of Cologne and Trier and made the Pope ubiquitous through the system of legates. Well could the old chronicler say: "Since the days of Gregory I. to our own time, sat no high priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicholas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign. To holy bishops and the clergy he was mild and gentle; to the wicked and unconverted a terror, so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him."

It is evident [wrote the great forerunner of Hildebrand] that Popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the Apostle if he were to return upon earth; since Constantine the Great has recognised that the pontiffs held the place of God on earth, the Divinity not being able to be judged by any man living. We are then infallable and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves.[2]

This is generally held to be spurious now, but the spirit of it may be said to be true. The archbishops eagerly accepted the decretals because they hoped to profit by their doctrines. Instead, however, through them they were subjected to the Pope and largely lost

[1] Schaff, iv., 275.

[2] De Cormenin, *Hist. of the Popes*, 248.

their independence. They were gladly received by the bishops, since by them they hoped to gain independence both of the tyrannical metropolitans and of the state. They were welcomed by the lower clergy and laity in general without a question because they came from a source so high in authority as the Pope and the bishops.

These forged decretals gave the Papacy a definite constitution; the Petrine theory was now proved by indisputable historical evidence—the ideal Papacy was made a fact from the very first. In fact the charge given by Peter to Clement, when the primate Apostle transmitted his power to a successor, is found in very characteristic language. The powers and relations of the whole dogmatic hierarchy from top to bottom were defined. The Popes from St. Peter on were made the parents and guardians of the faith of the world, and the legislators for it, and also the supreme judges in all cases of justice. In short this constitution logically completed the Petrine theory. The metropolitans were curtailed in their prerogatives and subjected to the Pope. Metropolitan courts were reduced to committees of inquiry. All original jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes was transferred to Rome. No metropolitan could call a synod now without the Pope's consent. The metropolitans' power over the bishops was greatly decreased and they were separated from the Pope by newly created primates. The bishops, in their turn, as ambassadors of God were made independent of both the state and the metropolitans, but subjected to the Pope. Peter and the other Apostles furnished the example for this arrangement. All episcopal cases were taken out of secular courts[1]; all secular cases could

[1] Alex., *Ep.*, i., ch. 5; Felix, *Ep.*, ii., ch. 12.

be carried to episcopal courts[1]; all laymen as well as lower clergy were excluded from episcopal synods. Bishops were made practically immune by the great difficulty of bringing accusations. In the trial of a bishop, the accuser had to have seventy-two duly qualified witnesses and if he failed to prove his case he and not the bishop was liable to punishment. At any time the bishop could break off proceedings by appealing the case directly to the Pope. The priesthood was definitely separated from the laity as the *familiares Dei*. They were the *spiritales;* the laity the *carnales.*[2] Priests were also freed from secular control and placed above it. They, in like manner, enjoyed certain immunities which made it no easy matter to proceed against them.

At the same time, the relations of Church and state were defined more clearly. Ecclesiastical power was now held to be supreme over secular power and that change was a pronounced revolution. "All the rulers of earth," it was dogmatically affirmed, "are bound to obey the bishop and to bow the neck before him."[3] Imperial control of the Church, exercised for eight centuries, was declared to be a usurpation which entailed disputes and wars. The state was represented as unholy, the Church as holy. That proposition struck the sword of justice out of the hand of the temporal prince and removed the clergy from the reach of the secular law. Clergy were freed from political courts and the laymen were excluded, in theory at least, from participation in Church legislation. In short these decretals carried the papal theocracy

[1] Anacletus, *Ep.*, i., ch. 4; Marcellinus, *Ep.* ii., ch. 3.
[2] Kurtz §86, ii., No. 2.
[3] Clement, *Ep.*, 1.

far beyond any claims made up to that time by the Popes themselves. It was left to Gregory VII. and Innocent III. to make the claim a living reality.

These decretals formed a part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* for six hundred years and supplied a complete set of laws concerning Church lands, usurpation and spoliation, ordinations, sacraments, fasts, festivals, relics of the cross and of the Apostles, schism and heresy, the use of holy water and the chrism, the consecration of churches, the blessing of the fruits of the field, sacred vessels, garments, etc. In this way society was influenced and modified in all its ramifications. Both the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Europe was affected for centuries to follow. Over and over again they were quoted to prove papal omnipotence against temporal authority. For the purpose of illustration, the decretals were replete with personal incidents and had in them many beautiful axioms of sincere and vital religious truth. The whole tone of the composition was pious and reverential. Pope, bishop, and lower clergy all gained by this shrewd and specious defence of the Papacy. The priesthood actually constituted the Church.

In this period of ignorance and lawlessness, while the Empire established by Charles the Great was disintegrating, the Papacy rapidly forged to the front as the champion of united Christendom; and to this end the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals contributed powerfully. How much was contributed that was actually new may be a question. Whether the history of the Church would have been the same had they not appeared is a disputed point. Whether the Pope without them could have become the greatest ruler of western Europe by the middle of the ninth century is not clear.

Whether the Papacy would have had a world-wide political interest from this time on without them is a question still unsettled.

Nothing better illustrates the immediate fruits of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals than the pontificate of Nicholas I. In the year 858 he was unanimously chosen Pope by the Emperor, and the clergy and people of Rome. He had been the friend and minister of Sergius II. and Leo IV. amid all their dangers and difficulties. His trying experiences qualified him for the responsible office. His personal qualities had won him many friends. Consequently there was general rejoicing when, in the presence of the Emperor and the Romans, he was inaugurated. Three days after the solemnity, the Emperor Louis II. entertained Pope Nicholas I. at a state-banquet and then withdrew a short distance from the city walls to receive the return-visit on the following day. As the Pope, escorted by the clergy and nobility, approached the imperial camp, Louis met him, dismounted from his horse, and conducted the Pope's palfrey the length of a bow-shot, after the ordinary custom of a bridle-groom. A sumptous feast was then served in the imperial tents, and the Emperor again escorted Nicholas a like distance on his return. The Pontiff, on parting, descended from his horse, embraced Louis, and kissed him. "And thus," says the chronicler, "they lovingly took leave of each other."

This imperial self-humiliation had beneath it a purpose. Louis II. hoped to extend his dominion beyond the borders of Italy, to which his brothers had reduced him, and desired the assistance of Rome. Nicholas I. was not averse to meddling in worldly affairs. Backed up by the false decretals, with pre-

cedents created by his sainted predecessors, with political confusion and secular wrangling as his ally, with his own boldness and clear intellect as his guides, he plunged into mundane affairs without hesitation. Ability and opportunity won for him one success after another. The first conquest he made was in humiliating the Italian primates of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, and in making the Italian clergy directly dependent upon Rome. Emperor Louis II. was forced to bow to papal authority in this matter, although hitherto the creation of new bishoprics had rested with the temporal lord.

Again when the bishopric of Hamburg was destroyed by the Normans, King Louis of Germany translated the dispossessed Bishop Anschar to Bremen. Now the Archbishop of Cologne claimed jurisdiction over Bremen and declared that the temporal power could not dismember an ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Both parties agreed to refer the case to Rome. Nicholas I. confirmed the separation and ratified the transference of Anschar. Charles the Great would have settled the case himself. Another victory was thus won in the name of Pseudo-Isidore. The policy of breaking down all interposition between the successor of Peter and the episcopacy had been clearly set forth.

A test of this principle came in the case of Hincmar, the able and powerful Archbishop of Rheims. In 861 he summarily suspended Rathod, Bishop of Soissons, for disobeying the sentence of a provincial synod in reinstating a priest whom he had unjustly expelled. Rathod at once appealed to the Pope and asked permission of Hincmar to go to Rome to present his suit. Hincmar refused the request and called Rathod before a second synod for contempt, when he was degraded

from his office and imprisoned in a monastery. Once more Rathod made a touching appeal to Nicholas I.[1] who forthwith rebuked Hincmar and ordered him to restore Rathod to his see, and to send him to Rome. King Charles the Bald was ordered, "by his love to God and his duty to the Holy See," to see that the order was enforced. Both Hincmar and Charles refused, and Rathod remained a prisoner for two years. Papal power was on trial, but Nicholas I. was equal to the situation. At last Charles was persuaded to intervene. Rathod was released and sent to Rome, but was not reinstated in his bishopric. The Pope reinstated him to office. To prove his authority he quoted the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which the Frankish clergy had framed to insure their own independence.[2] Hincmar remonstrated, but in the end was forced to apologise and obey. "Thus," complained Hincmar, "was a criminal, solemnly deposed by the unanimous judgment of five ecclesiastical provinces of this realm, reinstated by the Pope, not by ordinary canonical rule, but by an arbitrary act of power, in a summary way, without inquiry, and against the consent of his natural judges." Metropolitan independence was crushed, the royal power was forced to obey by the awful threat of excommunication, and papal supremacy was triumphant. Truly a new epoch had appeared in the rise of the mediæval Church, when the Pope could proudly declare that "the privileges of the Holy See are the panoply of the Church and title-deeds of him who is the supreme lord of the priesthood for the government of all in authority under him and for the comfort of every one that shall suffer wrong or injury from sub-

[1] Baronius, *Ann.*, 863.

[2] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, bk. vii., ch. 2.

ordinate powers"[1]; that "the action of synods, general or provincial, might be peremptorily arrested by a simple appeal to Rome . . . at any stage of the proceeding"; that every bishop must give lawful obedience to the "King of Bishops"; and that "any one, without exception of person, who shall disobey the doctrine, mandates, interdicts, or decretals, published by the Apostolic Bishop on behalf of the Catholic faith, the discipline of the Church, the correction of the faithful, the reformation of evil-doers, and the discouragement of vice, let him be accursed."[2]

In dealing with the schismatic, heretical Eastern Church, however, all careful reserve vanished and without fear or caution the Roman Pontiffs assert their prerogatives in a clear, decisive, and peremptory tone. In the Photian schism at Constantinople, Nicholas I. assumed the right to decide which of the two claimants to the patriarchate was legitimate. To Photius, who had secured the office by imperial aid, the Roman pontiff wrote a letter which up to that time was unsurpassed for supreme papal arrogance:

> Our Lord and Saviour . . . established the foundations of his church upon the Rock Peter. . . . Now upon this foundation the appointed builders have from time to time heaped many precious stones, till by this unwearied diligence the whole building has been perfected into indissoluble solidity. . . . Since this church of Peter is the head of all churches, it is imperative upon all to adopt her as their model in every matter of ecclesiastical expediency and institution. . . . From her all synods and all councils derive their power to bind and to loose.[3]

[1] Bouquet, vii., 391.
[2] Pertz, i., 462.
[3] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, bk. vii., ch. 6.

The pontificate of Nicholas I., who died in 867, marks the acme of papal power during this period. The history of the Western Church, controlled by Rome, during the latter part of the ninth and the tenth century, covers a period of unparalleled corruption and debility —"a death-sleep of moral and spiritual exhaustion." The Papacy as a constructive spiritual force almost disappears from view. The lofty ideas of Leo I., Gregory I., and Nicholas I.—their magnificent ambitions for the Church, their imperial rule, and their commanding, aggressive spirit—all disappeared. The causes may be found in weak, wicked, worldly Popes, in anarchy and political confusion in Italy, and in feudalism. The Church was reaping the reward of a close alliance with the state. All the gains made by the Church during this epoch were of a secular character. The moral and spiritual powers of Latin Christianity lay dormant beneath a mass of corruption, self-seeking, and worldly passions which covered them and nearly extinguished them. The marvellous vitality of the organisation of the Church alone saved her from disintegration in that period of decentralisation. The spirit of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, from this standpoint, had become the saviour of the Church. The next force that appeared in western Europe to rescue the Church from the low state of spiritual degeneration to which she had fallen was, strange to say, the Holy Roman Empire under the guidance of another mighty German ruler.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, ix., pt. 2, p. 144 *ff.* Has letters of six Popes.

2.—Schaff, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, viii., 601.
3.—Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, 319. Contains the Donation of Constantine.

Bibliographical Note:—There is no complete collection of these False Letters in English. Migne, *Patrologiæ*, cxxx., contains the first complete collection. The famous letters of Pope Nicholas I. are in vol. cxix. The latest and best collection is by Hinschius, Leip., 1863.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1872.
2.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* Lond., 1859. Bk. vii., viii.
3.—Janus (Döllinger), *The Pope and the Council.* 1869.
4.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.* Phil., 1883. Pp. 43–102.
5.—Lee, G. C., *Hincmar.* Balt., 1897. *Am. Soc. of Ch. Hist.*, viii.
6.—Newman, J. H., *Essays, Critical and Historical.* Lond., 1888. II., 271–5; 320–35.
7.—Oman, C., *The Dark Ages.* Lond., 1893.
8.—Prichard, J. C., *Life and Times of Hincmar.* Lond., 1849.

Bibliographical Note:—The best special discussions are not in English. Among them are, Blondel, *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus Vapulantes.* Geneva, 1628; Theiner, *De Pseudoisidor. canonum collectione.* Bres., 1826; Kunst, *De Fontibus et Consilio Pseud. collect.* Gött., 1832; Wasserschleben, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der falschen Dekretalen.* Bres., 1844; Weizsäcker, *Hinkmar und Pseudoisidor*, 1858; Schrörs, *Hincmar Erzbischof von Rheims, sein Leben und sein Schriften.* Frieb., 1884; Phillips, *Kirchenrecht.* Reg., 1845.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, 234. Allen, 50. Alzog, ii., 194–211. Butler, ch. 61–62. Coxe, lect. 5, sec. 4–6. Creighton, i., 12. Crooks, 331. Darras, iii., 18. Döllinger, iii., ch. 4, sec. 7. Emerton, 76. Fisher, 24, 169. Fitzgerald, ii., 28–54. Foulkes, ch. 7. Gieseler, ii., 324. Gilmartin, i., ch. 37. Greenwood, iii., ch. 6, 7. Hase, 184. Hurst, i., 494. Jennings, i., ch. 8. Kurtz, i., 511. Milman, iii., 58, 190. Milner, ii., 190. Moeller, ii., 160–164. Mosheim, i., 187, 414, 420. Neander, vi., 101, 110, 117, 122, 128. Robertson, bk. 4, ch. 1. Schaff, iv., 266–273. Sheldon, ii., 122.

CHAPTER XVI

ORGANISATION, LIFE, AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE CHURCH, SIXTH TO NINTH CENTURY

OUTLINE: I.—Organisation of the papal hierarchy. II.—Moral condition of the clergy and laity. III.—Great activity and wide influence of the Church. IV.—The ordeals and the Church. V.—Church discipline—excommunication and interdict—and penance. VI.—Worship—the mass—preaching—hymns. VII.—The sacraments. VIII.—Relics and saints. IX.—Sources.

THE Roman Catholic Church, based on the Bible and tradition, satisfying the religious needs of the age, and moulded by the historical forces of the period, changed from the democratic, apostolic Church to the powerful monarchial hierarchy of the Middle Ages, by a natural, historical process. The Pope, the Bishop of Bishops, stood at the head of the well organised hierarchy as the source of faith, the supreme lawgiver, the distributor of justice, the resort of last appeal, and the grantor of offices, honour, and favours. He came to hold the balance of power in the world-politics and claimed supremacy in secular affairs. To enforce his will he had an army of priests and monks, the sanctity and prestige of Peter's Chair, and the formidable weapons of excommunication and interdict. To assist him in his multitudinous duties, an extensive papal court had been gradually built up.

Just below the Pope in the hierarchy came the arch-

bishops, or primates, or metropolitans.[1] After the third century, the term metropolitan in the East meant the bishop who lived in the capital of a province. The Council of Nicæa recognised the office and gave the metropolitan the right to ordain bishops.[2] The Council of Antioch clearly defined the jurisdiction of the metropolitan.[3] He ruled the suffragan bishops, conducted episcopal elections, confirmed and ordained bishops, called and presided over annual episcopal synods. Somewhat later he came to exercise the right of deciding appeals.[4] Gradually the name and prerogatives were extended to the West, where about the seventh century the metropolitans were very powerful,[5] but by degrees they lost their power when secular princes, like the Merovingian kings, usurped their functions. Even the bishops adopted the short-sighted policy of preferring to have their superior at Rome instead of in their own province. Under the Carolingians, especially Charles the Great, and the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, however, they regained something of their earlier prestige. But they were subjected to the direct control of the Pope and existed as useful intermediaries between Rome and the ordinary bishops. In that limited sphere of activity, however, there were still many important duties left to the metropolitan of the Middle Ages. As early as the sixth century the Pope at Rome, as patriarch, claimed the right to sanction

[1] Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions*, Lond., 1887, 121; Smith and Cheetham, art. on "Metropolitan."

[2] Canon VI. See IV. See also Canon XIX of Council of Antioch.

[3] Canon IX.

[4] Cod. Justin, i., 4, 29.

[5] Guizot, *Hist. of Civ. in Fr.*, ii., 46.

the election of a metropolitan by the clergy of the province, and bestowed the "pallium" upon the candidate. The metropolitans, it must be remembered, were not generally separated from archbishops in the early history of the Church. When the differentiation did evolve, the archbishop became superior to the metropolitan.

The title archbishop was unknown in the Church before the fourth century. At first it was used as a sign of honour without implying superior jurisdiction over bishops. Perhaps Athanasius first used it in speaking of Bishop Alexander of Alexandria. Then Gregory Nazianzen applied it to Athanasius himself. Soon it came to be used in connection with the bishops of the most important sees in the East. Liberatus gave all the patriarchs the title of archbishops. The Council of Chalcedon even applied the name to the mighty patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople. When the Empire was divided into dioceses, which in turn were subdivided into provinces, an exarch or vicar was placed in the capital of each diocese. In conscious imitation, the Church established ecclesiastical exarchs or patriarchs in these local capitals. Archbishop was a common title for this office. The archbishop ordained the metropolitans, convened diocesan synods, received appeals from the metropolitan and his provincial synod, and enforced discipline in his diocese. In the West in the seventh century Isidore of Seville ranked the archbishop higher than the metropolitan. The precise distinction between the two offices, however, was not very clear and, finally, was lost entirely. These officers usually sided with the secular authorities against the Pope and tended to favour the organisation of national Churches with patriarchs at their head.

They attempted likewise to subject the bishops and priests to their rule and thus curtail the power of the Pope. The Popes, however, saw the danger and sought to avert it by appointing several archbishops in each country, and bestowing upon one of them the title of "primate" with the delegated powers of the Holy See. Thus England had the archbishops of Canterbury, the oldest (seventh century) and most important,[1] and of York (eighth century). Germany was ruled by the archbishops of Mayence, who was "primus" and who served as imperial chancellor until the time of Otto the Great,[2] Trier (eighth century), Cologne (eighth century), Salzburg (eighth century), Hamburg-Bremen (ninth century), and Magdeburg (tenth century).[3] France possessed the archbishops of Rheims, who was recognised as primate,[4] Aix, Aux, Bordeaux, Bourges, and Rouen. In Italy the Pope had a continual struggle with the archbishops of Milan, who claimed as their founder the apostle Barnabas, Aquileia, and Ravenna. The use of the title primate does not come into ordinary use, it seems, until after the appearance of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

Next in the hierarchy came the bishops. They resented, as a general rule, the pretensions of both the metropolitans and the archbishops and recognised the Pope as their friend and superior. Since all western Europe was divided up into episcopal dioceses, with one bishop in each diocese, they were both very

[1] See article on Theodore Torens in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

[2] Boniface (d. 735) was the greatest.

[3] Hauck, *Kircheng. Deutschl.*, ii.

[4] This office was held by Hincmar (d. 882), the greatest man of his time. Prichard, *Life and Times of Hincmar*, 1849; Noorden, *Hincmar, Erzbischof von Rheims*, 1863.

numerous and very powerful, particularly in local affairs.

For the first five centuries of the Christian era the election of bishops in the Church followed one general pattern. The neighbouring bishops nominated while the local clergy and laity approved the election and gave the requisite testimony of character. But with the evolution in the organisation of the Church, and as a result of the close alliance with the state, a series of important changes occurred. (1) With the rise of the metropolitans there appeared a new factor in the selection of a bishop. The metropolitan usually conducted the election, and confirmed and ordained the candidate. This came to be regulated by Church canons. (2) With the ascendancy of the state over the Church the selection of bishops was practically transferred to the laity. At times Emperors alone nominated. After the sixth century, the right of royal assent was generally acknowledged. It was but a short step to convert that secular assumption into a right of nomination. Thus the ruling power had come to control the election of bishops quite generally throughout the mediæval Church. Among the chief qualifications for the office were, in addition to a good character, an age limit of fifty years, ordination as priest, or at least as deacon, and membership in the local clergy. But these requirements were often broken and waived.

The bishop occupied an office of arduous duties and grave responsibilities. It might be said that he was the powerful ruler of his province. He administered all the Christian sacraments. He enforced discipline. He received all income and offerings, and managed all the ecclesiastical business of his diocese. He exercised the power of ordination and confirmation, and thus

perpetuated the Christian ministry. He did all the formal preaching and by visitation kept an oversight of the whole Church under his care. He was the natural medium of communication to and from his people and clergy. He was also an important factor in the local synod and served as the ecclesiastical judge of his district. All such matters as liturgy, worship, alms, dedication of churches, patronage, and protection of minors, widows, and the unfortunate came under his jurisdiction. Nor did his cares end here. Through the synod he helped to rule the province and through the general council he participated in the government of the Church at large.

The bishops controlled the priests, who were found in every section of Christendom in the sixth century, and who came into vital touch with the masses of the laity. As early as the third century, indeed, all churches began to conform to a single type. The independence of the presbyter of the early Church disappeared with the rise of the episcopal system. The subordination of the priest became, by the sixth century, complete. This result was inevitable because of the rise of the synodal system, the assimilation of the organisation of the Empire, and the development of the parochial system, which subdivided the diocese into smaller sections in the hands of priests.[1] The priests administered the sacraments to the people to whom they were the very bread of life and the means of salvation, heard them in their confessions, inflicted penances and gave them counsel, baptised their children, confirmed them, watched over all their deeds on earth, closed their eyes in death,

[1] Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions*, contends that the parish was of German origin, and not Roman.

and prepared them for the world to come, and even through prayers and masses interceded for their forgiveness in purgatory. Working side by side with the priests were the countless monks and nuns fairly swarming over western Europe, who also came into intimate touch with the masses. They were the teachers and preachers of the common people. In the hands of these priests and monks rested almost entirely the humane and charitable institutions of the Middle Ages. The true religion of Jesus was likewise in their hands rather than in the hands of the higher clergy.

At the bottom of the hierarchical pyramid were the laity, who by the twelfth century included all the people of western Europe, except a portion of Spain. Both canon law and imperial law forbade their performing any sacerdotal functions and ordered them "to be obedient to the order handed down by the Lord."

From the standpoint of morality,[1] this period was one of pronounced contrasts. Christian virtues and heathen vices, the strictest asceticism and the grossest sensuality, tyranny and crude democracy, all existed side by side with apparently no serious conflicts. It was an age of anarchy, confusion, lawlessness, immorality, and highway robbery on land and sea, accompanied by boldness, chivalry, and heroism. In the East, the Church had to contend with "the vices of an effete civilisation and a corrupt court." In the West, many of the old Roman vices were continued and even invigorated by fresh barbaric blood. It would be difficult to imagine anything more corrupt than the Merovingian court.[2] Of the whole period Gibbon

[1] *Acta Sanctorum;* Greg. of Tours, *Hist. of France; Mon. Ger.;* Mansi; Harduin; Hefele, iii., iv.; Lecky; Guizot; Balmes.

[2] Greg. of Tours; Milman; Lecky; Hallam; Gibbon.

declares that it would be impossible "to find anywhere more vice or less virtue."

The people at this time might be called more religious than moral. A little piety would cover a multitude of sins in the eyes of even the best. A whole life of wickedness and evil-doing was all wiped out and a home in heaven assured by the building of a church, monastery, shrine, or hospital, or by deeding property to the Church, or by doing some pious deed. An exaggerated belief in the supernatural and miraculous was universal. A physical hell, heaven, devil, and angels were just as real to the people as the earth, day and night, the sun and moon, and the seasons. The worship of saints and relics was very common, and particularly in favour with the most wicked. The seventh century had more saints than any preceding, except possibly the fourth. Under these circumstances, it was not uncommon to find good used as a cloak for evil and the greatest apparent sanctity united with the worst licentiousness.[1]

The clergy led society and set moral standards which the masses followed without question. They embraced all social ranks from the sons of kings to the sons of slaves. Politically they shared with the kings and nobles the rule of the people. The upper clergy had huge estates like the landed nobles, and were, in fact, recruited largely from the younger sons of noblemen. The clergy were everywhere immune from taxation and military service. Charles the Great and his successors gave them all the privileges granted by the Eastern Emperors from Constantine on. They could not be tried or sued before civil courts, but had their

[1] Butler, *Lives of Saints;* Lecky.

own tribunals. They were supported by the income from landed estates, gifts from the pious, and legally established tithes. Morally, they were as a rule superior to their flocks, although there are many disgraceful exceptions. Europe was cursed at this time with tramp priests without churches who swarmed over Europe demanding a livelihood because of the sanctity of their office. Contrary to law, bishops wore swords and lost their lives on battle-fields—even Popes engaged in warfare.[1] Drunkenness was not infrequent among the clergy and licentiousness was a common complaint against them.[2] The minutes of Church synods are full of censures and punishments for clerical sins and vices like fornication, intemperance, avarice, hunting and hawking, gambling, betting, attending horse races, going to theatres, keeping houses of prostitution, and others.[3] Celibacy was the prescribed rule of the West, but many of the clergy were either married or lived with mistresses. Hadrian II. was married before he became Pope and his son-in-law murdered both the Pope's wife and daughter (868).[4] But there were of course many noteworthy examples of purity in all ranks of the clergy. Married laymen upon entering the priesthood or a convent gave up their wives. The lowest depths, perhaps, were reached in the tenth and eleventh centuries, when even the Popes themselves, who should have stood for all that was best, set the example for the greatest evil. Reform did not appear until the coming of the monastic order of Clugny, the German Emperors, and the Hildebrandine Popes.

[1] Schaff, iv., 331.
[2] Greg. of Tours.
[3] Hefele, iii., 341.
[4] *Ibid.*, iv., 323.

The Church, however, during this trying, formative period was the moral ark of safety for Europe. It fought vice and encouraged virtue. It was the only promoter of education and culture. It taught the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and along with them were learned lessons of faith and duty. It emphasised both the need and importance of prayer, fasts, charity, pity, hospitality, and other virtues. Its ideals were always high—far above the masses of the Church members—though in practice the clergy did not always conform to the ideals. The Church was the one great light that pointed the people of this epoch to a brighter day and a better civilisation. The sanctity of the home life for the laity and of celibacy for the priests was asserted. Divorce was seldom permitted.[1] Woman's position and property rights were advanced. The Virgin Mary was constantly extolled as the incarnation of womanly purity, love, and devotion. Much wise and ennobling legislation on the subject of marriage was enacted. There are many instances, too, where the head of the Church, or one of his officers, bravely protected injured innocence, even against kings. Polygamy, concubinage, secret marriage, the marriage of relatives, and marriage with Jews, heathen, or heretics were forbidden.[2]

The Church inherited the patristic conception of Rome in regard to slavery. Jesus had made no direct reference to the social organisation. St. Paul, however, spoke of the relations of slave and master.[3]

[1] See the effort of Nicholas I. to protect the divorced wife of King Lothair. Greenwood, bk. vii., ch. 4.

[2] Lecky, ii., 335; Schaff, iv., 333; Brace, ch. 11.

[3] Philem. 10–21; 1 Tim. vi., 1–2; Eph. vi., 5–7; Col. iii., 22; Tit. ii., 9; 1 Pet. ii., 18.

"The world into which Christianity was born recognised slavery everywhere."[1] The early Church tolerated slavery, but emancipation was held to be an act of Christian charity[2]; hence converted Christians often freed their slaves on baptism.[3] The Church Fathers recognised the institution of slavery as a moral wrong established on a legal basis, but called Chrstian slaves brothers. Lactantius told Constantine that slaves were brothers in Jesus.[4] Ambrose suggested that the slave might be even superior to his master.[5] Augustine held that slavery was a sin which originated in the Noachian curse, but that Christ's sacrifice freed slaves, consequently the curse would disappear.[6]

The mediæval Church, inheriting the patristic view, sought not to abolish slavery, but to ameliorate it. Masters were requested, therefore, to provide spouses for their slaves.[7] Prayers were offered up constantly for the removal of their hardships.[8] They were granted all the Church feast and fast days.[9] Among the Christians there were many acts of manumission.[10] Constantine and his successors enacted many laws favourable to slaves.[11] The barbarian invasion, however, postponed for a thousand years the general emancipation of slaves. The Church itself was a slave-owner and slaves were found on the lands of convents,

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 524.
[2] Lactantius, *Inst. Div.*, vi., 12; *Apostolic Constitutions*, iv., 9.
[3] Baronius, *Ann.*, 284, No. 15.
[4] *Inst. Div.*, v., 14, 15.
[5] *De Joseph Patriarch.*, ch. iv., § 20, 21.
[6] *City of God*, xix., 15.
[7] *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii., 38.
[8] *Ibid.*, viii., 13, 19.
[9] *Ibid.*, 39.
[10] Sozomen, i., 9.
[11] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 542.

bishops, and Popes.[1] Even one of the Popes, Calistus, had been a slave.[2] But at the same time the Church was always an asylum for slaves and sought to protect them from cruel masters. Gregory the Great declared that all slaves held by Jews were free[3] and also emancipated heathen slaves upon turning Christian.[4] Thus both by precept and example the Church was the one great force paving the way for the gradual abolition of slavery.[5]

The Church, as the great advocate of peace and order, strove to abolish family feuds, blood-revenge, and private wars by substituting legal action and legal penalty against the author of crime.[6] The synod of Toledo in 693 forbade duels and private feuds.[7] The synod of Charroux in 989 and the Bishop of Puy in 990 proclaimed the "Peace of God."[8] The synod of Poitiers in 1004, in proclaiming the "Peace of God," decided that law should replace force in determining questions of justice. The synod of Limoges in 1031 issued an interdict against bloody feuds. The Church everywhere sought to have disputes settled by fines rather than fighting, by arbitration rather than litigation, by witnesses rather than by duels. The efforts of the Church in this era of lawlessness, of wanton

[1] Gregory I., *Ep.*, x., 66; ix., 103.

[2] Hefele, iii., 611. Slaves and serfs were admitted to priesthood. Leo I. objected to the practice (letter 4).

[3] See letters of Gregory I., iv., 9, 21; vi., 32; vii., 24; ix., 36, 110.

[4] For a statement of his attitude toward slavery and for an example of his manumission, see book vi., letter 12; book viii., letter 21.

[5] Balmes; Brace, ch. 21; Schaff, iv., 334; Lecky, ii., 66.

[6] Brace, ch. 12.

[7] Hefele, iii., 349.

[8] Thatcher and McNeal, Nos. 240, 241.

bloodshed, and of insecurity of property, to maintain peace and to secure justice form one of the most glorious chapters in her remarkable career. The Popes wrote letters and published encyclicals to recommend vows and habits of concord to all Christian nations. Great councils were called to spread abroad ideas of amity and brotherly love. The clergy preached it and enthusiastic monks went from village to village to proclaim it in the name of the "Prince of Peace." A veritable crusade of peace swept over Europe, and denounced war as anti-Christian. Brotherhoods of the Peace of God were formed to curb the militant feudal barons and to protect commerce, agriculture, women, children, travellers, strangers, and holy clerks. When the whole ecclesiastical machinery of the Church, with its power to withhold salvation gained through the holy sacraments and with its mighty weapons of excommunication and interdict, was wielded in behalf of peace, it was a force that could not easily be resisted.[1] To the Church, therefore, must be given the credit of making the first determined effort to limit, if not to abolish, the ravages of private war.

The famous "Truce of God," which originated in Aquitania in 1033, marks a new era.[2] Private war was the curse of the Middle Ages and the Church made an effort to check the evil. According to its provisions, bishops and abbots were to see to it that all feuds should cease from Wednesday evening till Monday morning. The penalty for violating the truce was at first excommunication, but later expulsion from a bishopric, loss of a benefice or property, severance of

[1] Brace, ch. 13.

[2] Hefele, iv., 698; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 242.

the right hand, decapitation, scalping, and other punishments were added. Archbishop Raimbald of Arles with other bishops and abbots asked the Church in Italy in 1041 to adopt the "Truce of God."[1] Pope Nicholas II. (1059) and Alexander II. (1068) made public proclamation of the peace, and, as a result of all these endeavours, it soon spread over France,[2] Italy,[3] Burgundy, Spain, and Germany.[4] Rulers were not slow to sanction and to enforce these peace measures. Emperor Henry IV. issued an edict in 1085 to enforce the "Truce of God" under frightfully severe penalties.[5] Pope Urban II. in the Council of Clermont, held a decade later, made it the general law of the Church.[6] The time was extended to the periods between Advent and Epiphany, Ash Wednesday and Easter, Ascension Day and Pentecost.[7] Various festivals and vigils were also included. If strictly enforced the "Truce of God" would have given Christendom peace for about 240 days out of the year. Its operation was preceded by the ringing of bells. The first Lateran Councils (1121, 1139, 1179) confirmed it and made it a part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*. The "Truce of God" later helped to produce the "land peace" in various parts of the Empire.[8]

The Church sanctioned and used the "judgment of

[1] Ogg, *Source Book*, §39.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, Nos. 240–244.

[3] *Ibid.*, No. 248.

[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 187; Thatcher and McNeal, Nos. 245–250; *Transl. and Rep.*, i., No. 2.

[5] Migne, cli., 1134; Henderson, 208.

[6] Munro, *Urban and the Crusaders; Transl. and Rep.*, i., No. 2, p. 8.

[7] Thatcher and McNeal, *cf.* Nos. 243 and 244. Hefele, iv., 696.

[8] Fisher, *Med. Europe*, i., 201; Thatcher and McNeal, Nos. 248–250.

God" or the ordeal as a better means of obtaining justice than by war.[1] This process of justice was not new, but had prevailed in the Orient and among the Celts and Teutons. It rested on this fundamental principle that the accused is guilty until he proves himself innocent and that God, as the source of justice, will protect the innocent. "Let doubtful cases," ran a Carolingian capitulary, "be determined by the judgment of God. The judges may decide that which they clearly know, but that which they cannot know shall be reserved for divine judgment. He whom God has reserved for His own judgment may not be condemned by human means."

There were four different kinds of ordeals: by water, by fire, by battle, and by some sacred emblem.[2] The ordeal by hot water was the oldest form in Europe.[3] It typified the deluge and hell. Hincmar of Rheims appears to have recommended it first. The accused was compelled, with naked arm, to find a stone or ring in a kettle of boiling water, or merely to thrust his arm into it. If his arm was scalded he was guilty, if not, innocent.[4] The ordeal by cold water was probably introduced by Pope Eugenius II. (824–827). The theory was that pure water will not receive a criminal, hence it was believed that the guilty would float and the innocent sink. The accused, therefore, was bound and thrown into the water, but held by a rope with which to pull him out.[5]

[1] Lea, *Superstition and Force.*

[2] Ogg, *Source Book*, §33.

[3] Lea, *Superstition and Force*, 196. There are references to this form in the Salic Law.

[4] Greg. of Tours, quoted in Lea, 198; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 234.

[5] For cases, see Lea, 228, 229; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 236, 237.

The ordeal by fire was performed either by hot iron or stones, or by a pure flame of fire. The accused was compelled to walk barefooted over six or twelve red-hot ploughshares, or to carry a piece of red-hot iron in his bare hand nine feet or more. The unburned, of course, were innocent.[1] Or the accused was asked to stick his hand into a flame, or walk with bare feet and legs through the fire.[2]

The battle ordeals were very old and widespread in Europe although not introduced into England until the Norman Conquest. They were used for both personal and international disputes. The right to contest was usually restricted to free men, but the young, sick, old, female, and clergy could furnish substitutes. Here again God, the Judge in all these cases, gave victory to the innocent.[3] The Church regarded this form of ordeal with disfavour. Both councils and Popes declared boldly against it. Innocent II., Alexander III., Clement III., Celestin III., and Innocent III. were outspoken in their opposition. It was expressly forbidden the clergy to engage in these combats without special license. Christian burial was even refused to those who fell in such combats. Civil law enforced the ecclesiastical opposition and thus gradually secured the elimination of the evil. This ordeal did not die out until the sixteenth century.

The sacred ordeals had to do with religious emblems. In the ordeal of the cross both the accused and the defendant stood before a cross with uplifted arms while special divine service was performed, or the arms were

[1] Lea, 201; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 235.

[2] Peter Ingens and the monk Savonarola were examples. Lea, 209.

[3] Lea, 75–174, gives cases.

extended in the form of a cross. The arms of the guilty person dropped first. Pepin first used it for divorce cases (752). Charles the Great extended it to territorial disputes (806). Louis the Pious abolished it in 816 because it brought the holy symbol into disrepute. The eucharist was likewise employed to protect the innocent and punish the guilty. The synod of Worms in 868 enjoined it upon bishops and priests accused of murder, adultery, theft, and sorcery. In the trial the eucharist was swallowed with this adjuration from the priest: "May this body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be a judgment to thee this day." In the famous encounter of Hildebrand and Henry IV. at Canosa, the Pope challenged the Emperor to undergo this ordeal, but the wily German refused.[1] A use was also made of relics for similar purposes—a test that was probably of ecclesiastical origin. The accused placed his hands on the sacred relics and made an oath of his innocence.

The Church played a very conspicuous part in all these ordeals. Church councils sanctioned them[2] and the clergy favoured them.[3] Not infrequently they were used to further the interests of the Church and to punish heretics. Priests usually prepared the contestants by fasts, prayer, and special service, presided over the trial, and pronounced judgment in God's name. This method of securing justice, however, provoked considerable opposition within the Church. As early as the sixth century Bishop Avitus of Vienne opposed the battle ordeal in the Burgundian Code. St. Ago-

[1] For other cases, see Lea; Thatcher and McNeal, Nos. 238, 239.

[2] Mainz, 880, Tribur, 895, Tours, 925, Auch, 1068, Grau, 1095, etc.

[3] Hincmar, Burckhardt of Worms, Gregory VII., Calixtus II., Eugenius II., St. Bernard, etc.

bard of Lyons (d. 840) wrote two enlightened treatises against the duel and the whole system of the ordeal.[1] Occupants of St. Peter's Chair like Leo IV., Nicholas I., Stephen VI., Sylvester II., Alexander II., Alexander III., Celestin III., Honorius III., all condemned the institution.[2] The famous fourth Lateran Council held under Innocent III. in 1215 forbade the use of religious ceremonies in these trials and thus practically abolished the institution. Secular rulers also sought to end the practice. Unfortunately, the Inquisition, which employed methods somewhat similar to the ordeal, followed too closely in its wake.

Perhaps the most important service of the Church to the civilisation of the Middle Ages was the extensive cultivation of charity, "the queen of the Christian graces."[3] Both the example and teachings of Jesus served as a model and were supplemented by the words and work of the Apostles, particularly Paul. In the early Church charity was a cardinal principle.[4] At first the remnants of the eucharistic feasts were employed as sources of relief to the poor and needy; later free-will offerings given to the bishop and collections taken in the churches were employed to the same end. Usually seven deacons distributed these contributions to the poor, sick, and needy in each congregation.[5]

In Rome the organisation of charity was begun comparatively early. The parish was introduced in

[1] Given in Migne, civ., 113, 250.

[2] Read Lea, 272.

[3] Lecky, ii., 84; Uhlhorn, *Christ. Char. in the Anc. Ch.*, bk. iii.

[4] Chastel, *Historical Studies in the Influence of Charity*. Tr., Phil., 1857.

[5] Schaff, ii., 374; Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., ch. 67.

the third century and in the fourth century Pope Anastasius divided Rome into fourteen "regions" and in them founded and endowed deaconries. Gregory the Great in the sixth century created seven districts in Rome ruled over by seven deacons and an archdeacon, built a hospital in each district, controlled by a deacon and a steward for the poor, sick, and orphans; and formed thirty parishes with thirty-six priests. He sold his extensive possessions and gave the proceeds to charity. Many of the great Fathers of the Church made similar sacrifices and never wearied of enjoining the duty of charity on Christians. The churches of Rome had large estates, especially in Sicily. One third of their income was given quarterly to charities.[1] Pope Gregory the Great also made monthly distributions of food to the poor, and each day sent part of his meals to feed the needy at his door. This model arrangement for charitable purposes in the capital of Christendom was copied quite extensively elsewhere and enlisted the services of thousands of priests, monks, and nuns in all sections of western Europe.

After Constantine legalised Christianity, charity became institutional and endowed, first in the East, then to the westward.[2] Perhaps the first public hospital was founded in Rome by Fabiola, a Roman lady, in the fourth century. St. Pammachus established another in the Eternal City. Paulinus built one in Nola. Still others were planted in Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia. Poorhouses, orphanages, and homes for the aged were likewise begun in this early period.

[1] Milman, ii., 117.

[2] Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*, art. "Hospitals."

As Christianity was spread over Europe by the missionary monks these charitable institutions were planted by it to help and comfort thousands in this period of war, famine, and pestilence, and to remain as the choicest heritage to the modern from the mediæval Church. In theory, mediæval charity was made one of the chief acts of piety, the most certain means of salvation, and perhaps emphasised too much the benefits to the donor and to his dead relatives, rather than to the worthy recipient.

Church discipline originated in the "power of the keys" and in the control of the sacraments. In the early Church it was a "purely spiritual jurisdiction."[1] After Constantine, however, it touched the civil and social status of the delinquents. During the entire Middle Ages it was a tremendous power because it was believed that the Church, ruled by the divinely appointed Pope and his army of ecclesiastics, was the "dispenser of eternal salvation" and that exclusion from her communion without repentance incurred eternal damnation. Discipline was administered either directly by the Pope or by the bishops and their representatives, the archdeacons, or in each congregation by the priest. Civil authorities aided the Church in enforcing discipline. Charles the Great ordered the bishops to hold annual public synodical courts to try cases of incest, murder, adultery, robbery, theft, and other vices contrary to God's laws.[2] The clergy and laity alike were investigated. Seven irreproachable synodal judges from each congregation reported to the synod on the state of morals and religion.[3] Similar synods were held

[1] Matt. xviii., 15–18.
[2] Gieseler, ii., 55.
[3] Moeller, ii., 115.

in Spain and England and soon came to be common throughout Europe. The ordinary penalties inflicted were fines, fasting, pilgrimages, scourging, imprisonment, and deeds of charity. Obstinate cases incurred excommunication. The penalties inflicted on the clergy were more severe than those on the laity.[1] About the same time developed the practice by which the priest heard the confessions[2] of his flock and doled out the punishment for their private offences. But by the ninth century confession to a priest had not yet become compulsory.

The most severe punishment on the individual was excommunication.[3] It could be pronounced by the Pope against a layman, either king or common man, or against a bishop or priest; or by a bishop against a layman or a priest. Its operation was direct and its effects severe. It cut the excommunicate off from the sacraments which alone could insure his salvation and subjected him to temporal punishments. As long as he was under the ban, he was a social outcast, like an outlawed criminal or a dangerous wild beast, debarred from all social greetings, food, shelter, and all intercourse. To kill him was not murder and he was left to die in lonely starvation. By the secular law, too, he lost all civil rights, could be seized and thrown into prison, and forfeited to the state all his property.[4] His whole family, likewise, were subject to the same disabilities.[5] If a king, his subjects were all released from allegiance to him. He was consigned to ever-

[1] Milman, i., 551.
[2] See *Cath. Encyc.* for the origin of the confessional.
[3] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist*, 236.
[4] *Ibid.*, 296, 416.
[5] *Ibid.*, 393.

lasting punishment, often with the most terrific curses, which were frequently written down with sacred wine and ink. This terrible fate dangled over the head of every member of the Church, dead as well as alive, but, of course, it followed only after the proof of guilt had been established in a careful, formal trial and after earnest entreaties to repent had been made. The theory, however, was too often abused.[1] With sincere repentance the punishment ceased and absolution followed.[2]

There are examples almost without number of the employment of excommunication, but a few conspicuous examples will suffice to show its operation. Ambrose in 383 excommunicated Maximus for murdering Gratian, the Emperor.[3] Gregory the Great excommunicated Archbishop Maximus of Salona and forced him to repentance (600).[4] The Archbishop of Sens (seventh century) launched the curse against unknown robbers of his church.[5] Pope Benedict VIII. excommunicated the despoiler of the monastery of St. Giles.[6] There were very many cases against kings, criminals, heretics, etc., and the punishment was even applied to animals. Thus in 975 the Archbishop of Treves excommunicated the annoying sparrows. Caterpillars which were ravishing the diocese of Laon were put under the ban in 1120 by the bishop. Even St. Bernard, on an occasion which may have been justifiable, pronounced an anathema in 1121 on a swarm of

[1] Lea, 264, 266, 303, 343, 345, 347, 362, 382, 421.

[2] The anathema was used in a sense and manner similar to excommunication. See *Cath. Encyc.* for an excellent discussion.

[3] Lea, 282.

[4] *Ibid.*, 298.

[5] *Ibid.*, 303.

[6] *Ibid.*, 337; Schaff, iv., 377.

flies which bothered him while he was making a pious speech.[1] Not only was this ecclesiastical cudgel used with the most telling effects in enforcing the law of the Church upon the disobedient and unbelieving, but it was not infrequently abused for personal revenge and spite or for other low motives.[2]

The interdict was another form of punishment, issued by a Pope or a bishop, against a city, diocese, district, or country, and involved the innocent along with the guilty. It had a counterpart among the barbarian tribes which made the family responsible for the crimes of individual members. This may have been its origin, for the Church adopted the same idea in applying excommunication to the barbarians. It began in a mild form as early as the fifth century, but ere long was a common punishment. The city of Rouen was put under the interdict in 586 for the murder of its bishop.[3] The Bishop of Laon in 869 pronounced the interdict on his diocese, but Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims removed it. The synod of Limoges enforced the "Truce of God" in 1031 by this means.[4] Gregory VII. applied it to the province of Gnesen to punish King Boleslaw II. for the crime of murder, and Alexander II. in 1180 thus afflicted all Scotland because the ruler expelled a papal bishop. Innocent III. in 1200 suspended it over France, because of the marital faithlessness of Philip Augustus, and for six years enforced it in England (1208) to humble King John. Its operation was very severe. All religious worship was suspended, the churches were closed, priests refused to

[1] Lea, 428.
[2] *Ibid.*, 416; Gregory the Great, bk. ii., Letter 34.
[3] Greg. of Tours, bk. viii., ch. 31.
[4] Gieseler, ii., 199, n. 12; Hefele, iv., 693–695; Schaff, iv., 380.

perform marriage and burial ceremonies, the people were ordered to fast as in Lent and were forbidden to shave or cut their hair.[1] Only the sacraments of baptism and extreme unction could be administered and then always behind closed doors. Penance and the eucharist could be extended alone to the mortally sick. All inhabitants of the afflicted region were ordered to dress in mourning, fast, and act in humility. Church bells were tolled at certain hours in the day, when all people were to fall upon their knees in prayer for the removal of the causes of the interdict. With such thunderbolts as the excommunication and interdict in the hands of the great High Priest of the Church, which could be hurled at will against any individual or people, and when the people blindly and unquestionably submitted to them, it can be seen how the power of the Papacy was augmented and the subjection of the clergy and laity alike increased.

The mass was the very centre of all Church worship. Pope Gregory I. established its mediæval form. The celebration of the mass was the bloodless sacrifice of Christ to God for the world's sins, a reconciliation of heaven and earth, of benefit to the living and to the pious dead. It is no wonder then that the mass was celebrated several times daily with the greatest ritualistic pomp and display. Masses for the dead, too, became popular as the doctrine of purgatory developed[2] and were usually celebrated as solitary masses. Lullus even ordered masses and fasts in order to obtain good weather.[3] The dogma of transubstantiation while generally held had not yet become Church law. Church

[1] Harduin, vi., 885.

[2] Gregory I. is usually credited with introducing this mass.

[3] Moeller, ii., 113

worship throughout western Europe was conducted in Latin, and consequently was little understood by the masses of the laity.

Although preaching was not a necessary part of the regular Church service, still it was not an unusual feature. Pope Gregory I. frequently preached with great earnestness, although his successors did not follow his example. Bishops were required to preach, but their negligence was proverbial.[1] The priests were commanded to explain to their people the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the nature of the sacraments. The models recommended were the homilies,[2] and the sermons of Gregory I.[3] The vernacular was used of course in all preaching and cathedral instruction.

The Church hymns of this period reflect the Christian life and worship. In the Latin Church the hymns are divided into three periods: the patristic epoch to Gregory I. (d. 604); the mediæval epoch to Damiani (d. 1073); and the classical epoch to 1300. These Latin hymns possess much fervour and some genius, and have a very pronounced character. Most of them were inspired by the Blessed Virgin and next in favour came the saints. There were many beautiful products like *Te Deum Laudamus.*[4] In the early churches no organ was used.[5] Pope Vitalian (657–672) probably

[1] Hefele, iii., 758, 764; iv., 89, 111, 126, 197, 513, 582; Mansi, xiv., 82.

[2] *Mon. Ger. Scrip.*, vi.–ix., 45–187; Wattenbach, *Deutschal. Geschichtsq.*, i., 134.

[3] Hefele, iii., 745.

[4] Stephenson, *Latin Hymns of the An.-Sax. Church;* Trench, *Sacred Latin Poets;* Chandler, *Hymns of the Prim. Ch.;* Mant., *Anc. Hymns from the Rom. Breviary;* Cazwell, *Lyra Catholica;* Neale, *Mediæv. Hymns;* Schaff, *Christ. in Song.*

[5] This is the practice of the Greek Church to-day, and also in several Protestant bodies.

first employed one, while Pepin and Charles the Great both received presents of this instrument from the East. After the eighth century it was generally used during the Middle Ages.[1] Church bells gradually came into use after the time of Constantine and were very numerous during this period.[2]

The origin of the term sacrament is not very clear. The Latin *sacramentum* meant the military oath of allegiance and the early Fathers apparently used it in that sense.[3] It was also spoken of as *mysterium* in the New Testament.[4] *Sacramentum* was thus early united with *mysterium* to denote the solemn, instructive, semi-secret, external religious rites of worship. Augustine's definition, "the visible form of invisible grace," or "a sign of a sacred thing," has become classic and was accepted for centuries. The number of sacraments was an evolution. Tertullian mentions but two, the eucharist and baptism. Cyprian spoke of a third, confirmation. The Vulgate apparently added a fourth, marriage.[5] Augustine mentioned the Lord's Supper and baptism particularly as sacraments but used the word in many other applications. The old "sacramentaries" of the eighth century and later extend the word sacrament to a great variety of rites such as blessing of the holy water, dedicating churches, etc., and have prayers and benedictions for the same. Robanus Maurus (d. 856) advocated four and Paschasius Rodbertus (d. 865) two sacraments, while Dionysius

[1] Hopkins and Rimbault, *The Organ, its Hist. and Const.*, 1855. See art. in Smith and Cheetham.

[2] See art. in Smith and Cheetham.

[3] Tertullian, *Ad. Mort.*, iii.; Vulgate iii., 16; Rev. i., 20; xxviii., 7.

[4] Rom. xvi., 25; 1 Cor. xiii., 2.

[5] Eph. v., 22.

Areopagita believed in six and Peter Damiani (d. 1072) enumerated twelve. Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141) asserted that there were thirty, but Peter Lombard (d. 1164) and Thomas Aquinas (1274) fixed on seven as the number, though they were not officially adopted by the Church until 1439.

The sacraments were the means of grace and spiritual food for the soul. They met the child at birth in baptism, accompanied him in life, and closed his eyes with extreme unction in death.

The most important of the sacraments was the eucharist. This solemn festival seems to have been at first a regular meal, probably the principal meal of the day in each family, at which the commemorative breaking of bread and partaking of the cup was a part. Subsequently, however, the local congregation met on this common basis. Certain abuses which resulted[1] led to the early separation of the agape, or love-feast, from the ministration of the eucharist of the bread and wine. Henceforth the eucharist became a distinct institution celebrated soon with solemn pomp by the priesthood alone. It was regarded as the symbol of unity among believers and of communion with the Deity. It became the test of Christian fellowship and membership. In the hands of the mediæval priesthood, it was a most effectual power, since the Church could withhold it and thus make those deprived of it outcasts certain of eternal damnation. Because of its grave importance, the Church made participation frequent and obligatory—and even administered it to infants and to the dead. In the early Church the eucharist was celebrated every

[1] 1 Cor. ch. xi.

Lord's Day and on the anniversaries of the martyrs. Later it was offered every day and after the time of Leo the Great several times a day as a daily sacrifice for daily sins. The celebration of the eucharist was called the mass—the culmination of all Christian worship—to which, however, only those fully initiated into Church membership were admitted.[1]

Baptism was likewise a very important sacrament. Although there is no evidence that Jesus ever performed the rite, still the New Testament shows that the Apostles and evangelists did.[2] Immersion and sprinkling were both early employed. The priest of course performed the rite, though in cases of urgency any person using the proper formula could do so. The effects produced by baptism were: regeneration; the infusion of sanctifying grace; the gifts of faith, hope, and charity; the remission of all sin, both original and actual, and also of all penalty due to sin, both temporal and eternal. Because of the great efficacy and the indelible character imparted by this sacrament, also its absolute necessity to salvation, it was common for catechumens to postpone the rite until the end of life drew near—as did Constantine the Great—for then it would wipe away all past records. Elaborate ceremonies in connection with baptism early developed. Candidates for the rite, called catechumens, were forced to undergo a long course of instruction. They could not witness the mysteries of the eucharist, but were dismissed after the response and genuflections. After baptism, which was ad-

[1] The catechumens, pagans, and heretics were not admitted. From the words used in dismissing the catechumens, when the mysteries were about to be celebrated,—*Ite, missa est*,—probably arose the use of the word "mass."

[2] Acts ii., 38–41; viii., 16, 37, 38; xix., 3–5; Matt. xxviii., 19.

ministered usually on great Church festivals, especially Whitsunday, the catechumens were received, given a Christian name, turned to the west to renounce the "devil and his works," exorcised by the priest, anointed with holy oil, and instructed in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine. Often an entire day was consumed in these ceremonies. The act of baptism with consecrated water was performed at the entrance to the church and usually the baptised received a white garment in token of his purity.[1] Beautiful baptisteries were early built either within the church or very near to the entrance.

In the Apostolic Church baptism was invariably connected with the imposition of hands.[2] Later, however, the two acts were separated. The laying on of hands in point of time came soon after the rite of baptism.[3] All priests could baptise, while only the bishops could perform the ceremony which gradually developed into the sacrament of confirmation. The permanent separation of baptism and confirmation did not occur, it seems, until the thirteenth century. The rite of baptism was ordinarily performed only in special baptismal churches and at certain stated periods. In popular opinion the baptised were placed under the protection and consecration of the divine power. The rite also signified subjection to the Church.

Penance was a sacrament and a pronounced institution of the Church of the Middle Ages. The New Testa-

[1] This robe, after being worn for some time, was frequently hung up in the church after the ceremony to remind the baptised one of his new status.

[2] Acts viii., 12–17, xix., 5, 6.

[3] Council of Elvira (306), canon 38. See Tertullian for one of the earliest explanations.

ment has in it but little on the subject of discipline.[1] In the early Church penance was exclusively spiritual, was not compulsory but had to be sought, occurred but once, was extended only to baptised communicants, always followed public confession before the whole congregation, and varied with the offence. The penitents removed all ornaments from their persons, dressed in sackcloth, the men shaved their heads and faces and the women wore dishevelled hair, put ashes on their heads, abstained from baths and all normal pleasures, and lived on bread and water. They were divided into four classes: (1) The weepers, who could only stand at the church doors and beg for prayers. (2) The hearers, who could enter the church for the scripture lesson, but had to leave before the eucharistic service began. (3) The kneelers, who could witness the first part of the eucharistic office and then departed with the catechumens. (4) The standers, who could remain during the whole service but were not permitted to communicate.

Out of these earlier conditions, penance came to be regarded as a sacrament instituted by Jesus for removing sins committed after baptism but involving contrition of heart and private confession to a priest as prerequisites,[2] and for the performance of good works, such as fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimages, endowing institutions of the Church, self-flagellation, etc. The priest then solemnly absolved the penitent. The Middle Ages produced regular "penitential books,"[3]

[1] Matt. xviii., 17, 18; 1 Cor. v.; 2 Cor. ii., 6–10.

[2] Mansi, *Coll. Concil.*, xiv., 33d canon of Council of Chalons (813).

[3] The best known of these books was compiled under the direction of Theodore, the Archbishop of Canterbury (669–690). It is given in Haddan and Stubbs, iii., 173. The Venerable Bede also

that is, a code of penalties for sins like drunkenness, fornications, avarice, perjury, murder, heresy, idolatry, and other crimes. These regulations were compiled from the Church Fathers, the Church synods and councils down to the seventh century, and other collections of authoritative sources. Nearly every diocese had its own special penitential code, but the general character and spirit were essentially the same all over the Church. Out of the system of penance grew the practice of indulgences, which was simply the substitution of a payment in money for the penance. Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury is usually credited with originating the principle of penance and the institution of indulgences,[1] but the system did not gain prominence until the time of the Crusades.[2]

Ordination was the sacrament of the hierarchy by which baptised persons were consecrated to perform the duties of priesthood. Like baptism it conferred an indelible character, hence could not be repeated. The sacrament of extreme unction was at first merely the use of consecrated oil to heal the sick.[3] But before long such veneration was bestowed upon the holy oil that as early as the fourth century people broke into the churches and stole the oil out of the lamps in order to use it for the working of miraculous cures. It was employed not alone by the priests, but by all Christians. It did not really become a sacrament until the time of

made a similar collection. *Ibid.*, 326. See quotations in Schaff, iv., 374. See Marshall, *The Penitential Discip. of the Prim. Ch.*, Lond., 1814; new ed. in *Lib. of Cath. Theol.*, Oxf., 1844.

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii., 371.

[2] See Green, *Indulgences*, etc., Lond., 1872, and Gibbings, *The Taxes of the Apost. Pen.*, Dub., 1872.

[3] See Mark vi., 13; Jas. v., 14, 15; Tertullian, *Ad. Scap.*, 4; Chrysostom, *Hom.*, 32.

Peter Lombard. Marriage was also held to be a sacrament, through which the priesthood controlled legitimacy, inheritance, and the validity of wills.

Out of pagan idolatry, hero-worship, and the veneration for the martyrs of the early Church grew both the practice of saint-worship and the use of relics. The day of the martyr's death was made a festival and the place of his burial was sanctified. It was believed that the martyrs had the power to intercede with the Divine Powers for the answer of prayers. Churches and shrines were built over the tombs of the martyrs, or their bones were carried into churches. These relics were thought to possess miracle-working power. Those places not blessed with relics felt it to be a great disadvantage, consequently imported the remains of martyrs and saints to meet the need. Regular calendars of saints appeared and children were named after them with the expectation of lifelong protection and assistance from the patron.

By the fourth century it was believed that the blessed martyrs, through communion with our Lord, shared in his attributes of omnipresence and omniscience. Prayers in behalf of the saints changed to prayers to them for help. This transition was particularly easy for those who were won from paganism because they were already accustomed to similar practices. A festival of All Saints was instituted by Pope Boniface IV. in 610, when the Pantheon was dedicated as a Christian church, though it was not commonly observed until the ninth century, when Louis the Pious made it general in the Empire. The festival of All Souls supplemented it in the tenth century and became very popular. Every day in the calendar was dedicated to one saint or more. Down to the tenth

century individuals renowned for some pious deed or for some suffering on account of the Christian faith were exalted to sainthood by the voice of the people with the consent of the bishop. Later, however, the bishops nominated the saints and the Pope conferred the honour. The first instance of papal canonisation was that of Ulrich, the Bishop of Augsburg, by John XV. in 973. Pope Alexander III. (1170), in the period when the Papacy was becoming all-powerful, seized this great prerogative into his own hands.[1] Each nation, district, city, and individual church had its saint. The fame of the saints was perpetuated by legend, hymn, painting, sculpture, and the sacred edifices built to their memory and honour. Consequently the tales and beliefs connected with the saints produced most of the literature of the Middle Ages—the poetry, the song, the history, and the subject of common thought, conversation, and feeling.

Closely connected with saint-worship was the universal use of sacred relics and a belief in their miraculous power. The dominant interest of popular piety circles around the saints and their relics. The relics in the church were the greatest treasure of the community, and the reliquary was the choicest ornament of the private room of the lady, in the knight's armory, in the king's hall, and in the bishop's palace. The use of relics and images developed comparatively early in the life of the Church.[2] By the time of Constantine the practice was common and approved by the Fathers. In fact, so wild were the people of the West for relics that imperial law had to prohibit the cutting of the

[1] Mabillon, *Act. St. Benedict*, v., Pref.; Mansi, xix., 169–179.

[2] See Chap. XIV. for a full account of the origin of image-worship.

corpses of martyrs into pieces for sale.[1] The great Ambrose refused to consecrate a church which had no relics. When the Pantheon was dedicated by Pope Boniface IV. twenty-eight cartloads of bones of martyrs were transferred to that building from the various cemeteries.[2] The seventh œcumenical council of Nicæa (787) forbade bishops to dedicate a church without sacred relics under penalty of excommunication. Traffic in relics became a regular business. St. Augustine reproved the wandering monks for selling bogus relics. Gregory the Great refused to send relics of St. Paul to the Empress of Constantinople, yet he very jealously distributed the filings of the chain of St. Peter. The relics increased until western Europe was full of them and every community had miracle-working wonders—the products of excessive piety, fraud, and credulity. All Christians believed in relics for it was an impious thing to doubt. The wood of the true cross "grew into a forest"; the nails were very numerous; at Sens was found the rod of Moses; at Aachen the swaddling clothes of Jesus; at other points a feather plucked from the wing of the angel Gabriel, the tears of Jesus, the milk of the Virgin, the emblems of the Passion, a piece of wood from the temple which St. Peter intended to build on the Mount of Olives; and the bones, hair, teeth, and garments of saints without number. These relics were employed to convert the heathen,[3] to heal diseases, to ward off danger,[4] to punish the wicked, to protect the innocent, and to bring good luck and general blessing.

[1] Cod. Theod., ix., 17, 7.
[2] This statement is given in Baronius.
[3] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 305.
[4] Greg. of Tours, bk. i., ch. 84.

The worship of Mary the Mother of Jesus became very pronounced after the fourth century. Tertullian put Eve and Mary alongside of Adam and Jesus. She was called the Blessed Virgin and the Mother of God. The festival of the Annunciation held in the fifth century soon led to the festival of the Purification of Mary, or the Candlemas of Mary. About the end of the sixth century developed the feast of the Ascension of Mary, to be followed the next century by the celebration of the birthday of Mary. High above all the saints and martyrs was the rapturous adoration of the "Queen of Heaven." After Gregory the Great the Virgin played a constantly increasing part in the Church of the West. Churches were erected in her honour everywhere and every church had at least a chapel consecrated to Our Lady.

Hell, heaven, and purgatory were very real indeed to the mediæval mind. Their location, form, and inhabitants were known exactly through mediæval credulity. Devils and angels were in constant communication in one way or another with the inhabitants of earth. All these forces and influences formed the mediæval mind and produced the mediæval civilisation.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—The Church Fathers. See Chap. X.
2.—The Acts of Church Councils. See Chap. IX.
3.—The Early Church Historians. See Chap. XIII.
4.—Gee, H., and Hardy, W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Lond., 1896. I., 59.
5.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1892.
6.—Ogg, *Source Book.*

7.—Robinson, J. H., *Readings*, i.
8.—Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*.
9.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints*.

Bibliographical Note:—The original sources for this phase of the history of the Church are nearly all in Latin: 1.—Migne, *Patrologia*. 2.—Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*. 3.—Pertz, et al., *Monumenta Germanæ Historica*. 4.—Muratori, L. A., *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Med., 1723–51. 28 vols. 5.—Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*. 6.—Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum*. 7.—Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*. 8.—Bouquet, M., *Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores*. Paris, 1868 *ff*. 23 vols. 9.—*Rerum Historica Britannica*. Lond., 1858 *ff*. 10.—Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. 11.—Potthast, A., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (1198–1304). 12.—Pflug-Harttung, J. v., *Acta Pontificum Romanorum Inedita*. Tüb., 1881. Stutg., 1884–8. 13.—Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttum*.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Andrews, W., *Curiosities of the Church*. Lond., 1891.
2.—Balmes, J., *European Civilisation: Protestantism and Catholicism Compared in their Effects on the Civilisation of Europe*. Lond., 1849.
3.—Baring-Gould, S., *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*. Lond., 1869.
4.—Bethune-Baker, J. F., *The Influence of Christianity on War*. Camb., 1888.
5.—Brace, C. J., *Gesta Christi*. Lond., 1886.
6.—Buckle, H. T., *History of Civilisation in England*. N. Y., 1878. 3 vols.
7.—Cox, G. W., and Johns, E. H., *Popular Romances of the Middle Ages*. Lond., 1880. 2 vols.
8.—Cunningham, *The Growth of the Church in its Organisation and Institutions*. Lond., 1886.
9.—Cutts, E. L., *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages*. Lond., 1872.

10.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *Fables Respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1872.
11.—Hatch, E., *The Growth of Church Institutions.* N. Y., 1887.
12.—Lacroix, P., *Manners, Customs, and Dress of the Middle Ages.* Tr. N. Y., 1874. *Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1879.
13.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.* Phil., 1869. *Superstition and Force.* Phil., 1871. *Sacerdotal Celibacy.* Bost., 1884. *Auricular Confession and Indulgences.* Phil., 1896. 3 vols.
14.—Lecky, W. E. H., *European Morals.* N. Y., 1877. (To 9th cent.)
15.—Lewis, *Paganism Surviving in Christianity.* N. Y., 1892.
16.—Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages.* Lond., 1845.
17.—Marshall, *Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church.*
18.—Poole, R. L., *History of Mediæval Thought.* Lond., 1872.
19.—Trench, R. C., *Lectures on Mediæval Church History.* N. Y., 1878.
20.—Walcott, M. E. C., *Traditions and Customs of Cathedrals.* Lond., 1872.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, *Civ.*, ch. 3. Addis, ch. 7. Adeney, ch. 11, 12. Alzog, ii., 111–118, 243–256, 257–292. Bouzique, ii., ch. 2, 3. Butler, ch. 32, 33, 36–39, 58, 60, 64. Cheetham, ch. 13. Coxe, lect. 1–4. Döllinger, ii., ch. 5, sec. 11–20; iii., ch. 4, sec. 2, 3, 5, 7. Fisher, 110, 155, 175. Foulkes, ch. 5–11. Gieseler, ii., 310, 318, 420, 431–446. Gilmartin, i., ch. 12–15, 36, 40. Guericke, sec. 76–80. Kurtz, i., 352–396, 496–514, 516–526. Milman, bk. 3, ch. 5. Moeller, ii., 111–121, 210–221, 292–320, 321–345. Neander, ii., 661–678; iii., 91–106, 123–141, 425–456. Pennington, ch. 2. Robertson, ii., 186–244, 493–546. Schaff, iv., 326–355, 379–470, 571–581, 621.

CHAPTER XVII

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE AND THE PAPACY

OUTLINE: I.—Decline of the Empire under the later Carolingians. II.—Preparations to restore the Empire on a German basis. III.—Otto the Great creates the Holy Roman Empire. IV.—Holy Roman Empire attains its height under Henry III. V.—Results of the creation of the Holy Roman Empire. VI.—Sources.

THE Empire created by Charles the Great rapidly declined under the later Carolingians. The causes for this dissolution were:

1. The principle of division of rule, which was practised before the time of Charles the Great, and endorsed by him, produced five divisions of the Empire within thirty years. This was fatal to stability and permanency.

2. The disintegration of the Empire into national states resulted from the growing differences of race, language, institutions, and laws.[1]

3. Powerful feudal dukedoms arose such as Bavaria on the Danube, the barrier against the East; Swabia on the upper Danube and Rhine; Franconia on the Rhine and Main north of Swabia; Saxony on the Ems, Weser, and Elbe north of Franconia; Burgundy, a kingdom south-west of Swabia; Aquitania in southern France;

[1] See Strassburg oaths (842), and treaties of Verdun (843) and Meersen (870). Given in Thatcher and McNeal, No. 16–19; Ogg, §24, 25.

Brittany in north-western France; Normandy in northern France; and others.

4. The rulers who succeeded Charles the Great were, as compared with him, men of very inferior ability.

5. The poor roads made it almost impossible to keep in touch with all parts of the wide Empire. The well-built roads of the Romans had generally fallen into decay, simply because there was no longer a corps of trained engineers to keep them up.

6. The scarcity of money likewise prevented the ruler from securing the services of a great body of able officers, and also made it impossible for him to support a standing army to enforce his will everywhere.

7. The barbarian invasions from the east and the north brought in the Northmen, Slavs, and the Hungarians, while the Saracens were attacking Italy and southern France.[1]

Before the ninth century closed, the territorial unity of the Empire of Charles the Great was broken up. Charles the Bald (875–877) ruled France as king, held Italy as Emperor, and sought to gain control of Germany but was prevented by death from doing so. Charles the Fat (881–888) held Germany as king, controlled Italy as Emperor, and was invited to assume the French crown because Charles the Simple, a weak-minded boy of six, could not cope with the marauding Northmen. Charles the Fat, the last legitimate East Frankish male descendant of Charles the Great, accepted the proffered throne (885) and thus reunited all the parts of the Empire of Charles the Great except Burgundy. But Charles the Fat was too weak to hold the reins of government over so

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 158 *ff.*; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 20, 21.

vast an area. He bought off the Northmen by a disgraceful treaty (886) to the disgust of the French, was driven out of Italy (887), and then, deposed and deserted by his German subjects, he crawled off to an unregrettable death on his Swabian estates (888).[1] This was the last union of France and Germany under one ruler until Napoleon the Great carved out his vast Empire in western Europe.

When the line of the Carolingian rulers, called into existence by papal coronation in 800, ended with the death of the last legitimate descendant in the male line, Charles the Fat, in 888, a new problem confronted western Europe. The right of appointing a new Emperor reverted to Rome and the Pope. The Empire of Charles the Great fell asunder and from it emerged four kingdoms.[2] West France chose Odo of Eudes as king. East France, or Germany, elected Arnulf. The kingdom of Burgundy was divided between two rival rulers. Italy, except the southern part which was still loyal to Constantinople, was also divided between the parties of Berengar of Friuli[3] and Guido of Spoleto.[4] The former was chosen king by the estates of Lombardy, the latter was crowned Emperor by the Pope Stephen VI. and not long afterwards, to insure the permanency of the imperial title in his family, had his son Lambert crowned co-Emperor in 894 by Pope Formosus.[5]

[1] Pertz, i., 405.

[2] See Thatcher and McNeal, No. 22.

[3] He was a great-grandson of Charles the Great through his mother Gisela, a daughter of Louis the Pious.

[4] He was by birth a Neustrian Frank and also claimed descent from Charles the Great. He had large estates in Lorraine as well as central Italy.

[5] Pope Formosus had a rather checkered career. He was

Of all the various knights who appeared in different parts of the Empire immediately after 888, the strongest and most able was Arnulf, a bastard nephew of Charles the Fat, but a warrior of renown, who was raised on the East Frankish throne by the disgusted nobles in 888. A descendant of Charles the Great, he was, for a very brief period, looked upon as the head of the Carolingian Empire. Odo of Eudes, the Count of Paris, placed his royal crown in the hands of Arnulf and received it back as a royal vassal. Berengar of Italy also did homage to Arnulf and received his kingdom as a fief. Soon, however, local kings set up by the people arose and Arnulf restricted his rule to Germany and Italy.[1] He defeated the predatory Northmen, checked the inroads of the warlike Magyars, and by storming Rome compelled the Corsican Pope Formosus to crown him as Emperor (896).[2] Then he turned his attention to the boy Emperor in Italy, the Duke of Spoleto, but was smitten by disease and hastened back to Germany (d. 899).[3] Italy was thus left to sixty years of tumult and anarchy. With the death of his son, Louis the Child, in 911, the Carolingian dynasty passed away in Germany. In 987 the powerful French barons set aside the Carolingian heir and elected Hugh Capet, the Duke of France, as king of the feudal monarchy and the Archbishop of Rheims crowned him.[4] The Carolingian Empire was at an end. For more than

Bishop of Porto and papal legate. John VIII. had excommunicated him for political motives. Marinus restored him to power. He was the first Pope to be elevated from another see to that of Rome. Moeller, ii., 172.

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 22.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 23.

[3] Emerton, *Med. Europe*, 94.

[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 195; Ogg, §29

half a century now the imperial crown was a reward in the Pope's hands to be bestowed upon this or that Italian noble for "value received."[1]

The first half of the tenth century seemed to be the very nadir of political order and conscious culture. It is almost impossible for a modern mind to comprehend the torrents of barbaric destruction sweeping in over western Europe from all sides. As compared with the Teutonic invasion of the Roman Empire five centuries before, the onslaught was more sudden and fiercer while the internal resistance was much more poorly organised and consequently weaker. For several centuries these forces had been gathering. Charles the Great had held the torrent in check. But not long after the dissolution of his Empire the onslaught began. The merciless Saracens roamed the Mediterranean Sea as its masters, laid waste the Christian seacoast towns, and even sacked Rome itself, the seat of Empire and Christian rule. The Danes and Northmen swept the North Sea, the English Channel, the Atlantic coast, and pierced France and Germany by their rivers, almost to the heart, killing, robbing, and taking captives. They even boldly passed Gibraltar into the Mediterranean and fell upon Provence and Italy, where they left an indelible impression.

Meantime on land the Slavic barbarians, the Wends, the Czechs, and the Obotrites, rebelled against the German yoke and threatened the whole north-eastern border of the Empire. Behind them were the Poles and Russians. Farther south came the unruly Hungarian tribes which "dashed over Germany like the flying spray of a new wave of barbarism, and carried

[1] Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, ch. 6, p. 83.

the terror of the battle-axes to the Apennines and the ocean."[1] These blows from all sides knocked out the foundations of the imperial structure, already weakened to the point of dissolution by internal decay, and it fell. As a result reliance for protection on a common defence and imperial organisation was abandoned. Feudalism replaced the Empire. The strong built fortress castles, the weak became their vassals. Local authorities—counts, dukes, lords, bishops, and abbots—saw new duties and new opportunities. They took a firmer hold, converted a delegated into an independent power, a personal into a territorial jurisdiction. Recognition of a distant, weak imperial or royal authority was only nominal and feeble at that. The grand dream of a mighty, universal Christian Empire was being rapidly lost in the decentralising forces, and in the increasing localisation of all powers. During this period of weakness and confusion, the mediæval Church, instead of standing forth as the source of strength and intelligence, instead of making further gains of a political and ecclesiastical character for the See of St. Peter, seemed to fall into "a death-sleep of moral and spiritual exhaustion."[2] The Papacy as a religious organisation almost disappears from view. The commanding spirits of Gregory the Great and of Nicholas the Great were utterly forgotten. The victories gained through the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were not followed up. A really great Pope at this time might easily have realised all the dreams of Innocent III., but none such wore the papal tiara.

With the death of Louis the Child (911), Germany

[1] Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, 79.
[2] Greenwood, bk. viii., ch. 1.

was confronted by a serious problem.[1] Would the powerful German dukes set up independent kingdoms? Or would they invite Charles the Simple, the genuine Carolingian sovereign of France, to include Germany in a reunited Frankish empire? Or would they create a German monarchy on an independent basis? The German nobles met at Forchheim to consider the situation. Charles the Simple was not even thought of—a significant fact, because it showed that the imperial idea was at a low ebb in Germany. The instinct of nationality was beginning to be felt. The nobles urged the beloved and honoured old Duke of Saxony, Otto, to accept the crown of a feudal monarchy, but he declined and urged the election of Conrad of Franconia. Conrad accepted the responsible honour and was crowned and anointed by the Archbishop of Mainz without reference to the papal power. His reign (911–918) was filled with wars against the powerful dukes who objected to the rigid enforcement of his royal rights and the consequent curtailment of their prerogatives, The clergy, on the contrary, upheld the king because they clearly saw that their interests would be best cared for by a simple, strong government. When Conrad died (918) he had made little headway toward the creation of a powerful centralised monarchy.[2]

The nobles of Saxony and Franconia met in 919 and chose Henry, the son of Conrad, Duke of Saxony, as king (919–936).[3] To the Archbishop of Mainz, who wanted to crown him, Henry said: "Enough for me that I am raised so far above my sires as to be chosen

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 245.
[2] *Saxon Chronicle*, quoted in Emerton, *Med. Europe*, 102.
[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 247.

and called king through the grace of God and your devotion; let the sacred unction and crown be for better men than I." Had he seen too much of kings crowned and ruled by priests? At least his action pleased the whole assembly. By wise concessions he forced Swabia and Bavaria to accept him as king and rewon Lorraine as a part of the German kingdom. He thrust back the terrible Magyars, conquered the Danes, and humbled the Bohemians. He reformed and reorganised the military system and protected the kingdom by building fortified towns along the northern and eastern frontiers. When he died all the German people were under one rule, peace reigned throughout the kingdom, feudalism had received a check, trade was flourishing, the position of the freemen was improved, and the German kingdom had been established on a firm basis independent of the Empire. But death alone, perhaps, prevented him from claiming the imperial crown.[1]

Under Otto the Great, however, the old Empire was to revive and become very active, but on a German foundation. The traditions of the Carolingian house, the Italian puppet Emperors, the Papacy, and the law, philosophy, theology, and education of the day all helped to keep the idea of Empire alive.[2] Otto, born in 912, was the son of the Saxon king Henry I. and Matilda, who traced her descent to Charles the Great. He spent his youth at the court and in the wars of his father, and was regarded as haughty, overbearing, and ambitious. He married Edith, the daughter of the King of the Anglo-Saxons (929).

When Henry I. died in 936 the nobles and bishops met at Aachen in the old cathedral and formally

[1] Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, 77; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 26.
[2] Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, ch. 7.

elected Otto I. as King of Germany. As Otto entered the cathedral a few weeks later to be coronated the Archbishop of Mainz cried out: "The man chosen by God, nominated by our master Henry, and declared king by all the princes." He was then crowned, anointed, and girded with the royal sword by the Archbishop. In the coronation festival that followed the German dukes for the first time acted as the king's servants. The coronation was very significant because it showed Otto's attitude toward the Church, indicated the lofty position of the royal crown and the subjection of the dukes, revealed the possibility of a strong, united German kingdom under right management, and proved the popularity and opportunity of Otto I. as King of the Germans.[1]

Otto took Charles the Great as his model and sought to transform the loose federal state of his father into a strong, compact monarchy by reducing the power of his vassals. By quelling the various rebellious dukes Otto made them his own appointees, and was recognised as the master of the German nation. The name "Deutsch" began to be applied to his subjects and their tongue. He manifested no less activity in foreign affairs as is shown in his invasion of France to compel homage from Hugh the Great, his son-in-law; in his conquest of the Slavs between the Elbe and the Oder; and in his reduction of the unstable Danes to submission.

Otto was ready now to give his attention to Italian affairs. Adelaide, the beautiful young widow of the son of King Hugh of Provence, had refused to marry Adalbert, the son of Berengar II., King of Lombardy,

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 27; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 249.

hence was cast into prison and cruelly treated. She escaped with the aid of the Bishop of Reggio and appealed to the mighty German sovereign for deliverance.[1] Otto, touched with chivalrous sympathy, and seeing an opening for the realisation of imperial ambitions, marched with a great force into Lombardy (951). Berengar was forced to hold his kingdom as a vassal of the German crown. Otto, a widower at this time, then married his fair protégée. Civil war in Germany compelled him to give up his journey to Rome, however, and instead to return home. Otto's son, Ludolph, who feared that his father's recent marriage with the fair widow might deprive him of the German crown, plotted with the old Archbishop of Mainz and discontented German nobles, to secure the throne. The resulting war involved the whole kingdom and shook Otto's power and ability to the roots. The approach of a common foe, however, the terrible Magyars, led the nation to rally around Otto. In the decisive battle of Lechfeld (955) the Huns were effectively checked and began to settle the lands which they still occupy.[2] Otto was now unquestionably the most powerful monarch in Europe. Such rulers as Louis IV. of France and the King of Burgundy sought his friendship and aid. His own people began to call him "The Great."

The way seemed to be open at last for the realisation of Otto's imperial dreams. He was a descendant of Charles the Great in the female line. He was the complete master of a large part of the Empire with the northern capital in it. He had already taken the crown of Lombardy. On the battlefield of Lechfeld

[1] Pertz, iv., 328, 330.
[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 28.

(955) his victorious troops saluted him as "Imperator Augustus, Pater Patræ."[1] He had likewise proved himself a most worthy champion of the Church by allowing the Church to crown him; by enriching the German Church, giving it a better organisation, and subjecting it to his will; and by labouring zealously to convert the heathen on his borders.[2]

Italian affairs called him thither a second time. Berengar after recovering his throne was ruling as a tyrant in the north and had violated a portion of the patrimony of St. Peter. Mohammedan corsairs were devastating the south. The rest of Italy was full of anarchy and desolated by the feuds of a crowd of petty nobles most of whom were scrambling for the imperial crown. A row of inferior Popes had brought the Papacy itself into disrepute. Thus the solicitations of his family, the approval of his people and nobles, the cry of the oppressed Italians, the expectation of the nobility, and the request of Pope John XII. and influential churchmen, all impelled him to realise his own wish.

Therefore, in 957, Otto sent Ludolph with a large force against Berengar. The Crown Prince died in the midst of victory. Then Otto had his little son crowned as Otto II. in 961 and crossed the Alps with a big army. All resistance vanished before this new Charles the Great. In a general diet of the Lombard kingdom Berengar was deposed and at Pavia the German monarch was formally crowned "King of Italy." Early in 962 he triumphantly entered the Eternal City. The Pope gave him hearty greeting, held services of thanksgiving, and gave a great feast in his honour. On the

[1] Pertz, iii., 459.

[2] Hauck, *Kircheng. Deutschl.*, i., 69.

following Sunday the imperial coronation occurred in the church of St. John Lateran.[1] The King promised to protect and defend the Church[2]; the Pope to be an obedient subject of the Emperor; and the people to choose no future Pope without Otto's consent. Otto was then anointed by the Pope, the imperial crown was put on his brow, the imperial robe was adjusted, and the imperial sword was buckled on while the populace shouted "Long live Otto, Emperor Augustus." The head of that race which Charles the Great had converted by the sword had revived the Empire, the policy, and the traditions of that renowned ruler.

The papal policy of Emperor Otto I. was soon revealed. He granted to the Church the most famous and the most important "constitution" since that of Lothair (824) in which all the grants of Pepin, Charles the Great, and Louis the Pious were confirmed and the rights of the Emperor in papal elections clearly defined.[3] Otto had no sooner reached northern Italy to subdue the irrepressible Berengar and his sons, however, than Pope John renounced his allegiance to his new master, conspired with Berengar, and even incited the heathen Magyars to invade Germany.[4] The Emperor refused to believe these plots until confirmed by his own messengers and even then excused the young Pontiff by remarking: "He is only a boy; the example of good men will reform him."[5] He then hastened to Rome to begin that work.

[1] Bryce, 88. Fisher, *Med. Emp.*, i.; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 29.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 53.

[3] *Mon. Ger. Hist. Leges*, ii., 177; Watterich, i., 675; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 54.

[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 253.

[5] Luitprand, *Hist. Ottonis*, ch. 5.

Pope John at once sent legates to Otto promising amendment and accusing the Emperor of having broken his solemn promise. Otto excused his actions and, after the custom of the age, challenged the Pope to settle the dispute either by the wager of a solemn oath or by the ordeal of battle. Both offers were refused and Otto took Rome. John "seized most of the treasures of St. Peter and sought safety in flight." [1] Otto, at the request of the Roman clergy and people, called an ecclesiastical council in St. Peter's to try him (963). John XII. was proved guilty of the whole category of mediæval crimes: celebrating mass without communing himself, ordaining a bishop in a stable, accepting bribes for ordination, consecrating a ten-year-old bishop, neglecting the repair of churches, being guilty of adultery and incest, making the Lateran a brothel, going out hunting with the nobles, putting out the eyes of his own godfather, Benedict, cruelly murdering the archdeacon John, setting fire to houses like Nero, wearing the armour of a warrior in Rome, drinking to the devil's health, neglecting matins and vespers, never signing himself with the cross, and even invoking the aid of Venus, Jupiter, and other demons when gambling.

Thrice John was summoned to appear before the council in order to clear himself of the charges. At the request of the council the Emperor wrote a letter addressed to the "Pontiff and Universal Pope John" asking him to appear:

> Having arrived in Rome on the service of God, and having inquired of your sons the bishops and clergy, and of the people of your Church, why you have forsaken

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 29.

them, such scandalous and obscene things have been reported to us concerning you, that if the like had been told us of a common mountebank we should have hesitated to repeat them. But that you may not be wholly ignorant of what it is that is said of you, we will specify a few of these things only; for if we would enumerate all, the daylight would fail before we would make an end of writing. Know, then, that you are accused—not by individuals but by the unanimous voice of clergy and laity—of homicide, sacrilege, perjury, and incest. It is also said of you, that in your sports you have called upon the names of Jupiter, Venus, and other demons of the old world. We therefore do earnestly entreat your paternity that you delay not to return to Rome, and to purge yourself from these heinous crimes, and if perchance you should stand in fear of the rude multitude, we are ready to pledge our oath that nothing contrary to canonical rule and order shall be done against you.[1]

But the fiery young Pope contemptuously replied: "John, bishop, the servant of all the servants of God, to all the bishops: We hear that you design to elect a new Pope. If you do, in the name of Almighty God I excommunicate you and forbid you to confer orders or to celebrate mass." In a spicy answer Otto asked John to mend both his Latin and his morals, and promised him a safe conduct to the council, but "the Pope was gone out hunting" and did not receive it. The council then formally deposed John as a "monster of iniquity" and unanimously chose the papal secretary, a layman, as Pope Leo VIII.[2] Thus the new Emperor had deposed one Pope, by what must certainly be pro-

[1] Greenwood, bk. viii., 477; Gregorovius, *Rome in M. A.*, bk. vi., 346.

[2] Th cather and Mc²Neal, No. 55.

nounced an illegal method, and had elected another—a power never claimed by Charles the Great.[1] This, apparently, was Otto's interpretation of his oath to protect the Holy See. The ancient relation of the Empire to the Papacy was thus re-established.

The Romans, fickle as usual, soon wearied of a German yoke, and, at a favourable opportunity, broke out in furious rebellion against the Emperor and his Pope, but were subdued with terrible revenge. When at length Otto left Rome to capture Berengar's son Adalbert, they at once attacked the defenceless Pope and recalled John XII., who wreaked sweet and cruel vengeance on the leaders of the imperial faction. An obsequious synod reversed all the decrees of deposition. When John XII. was killed in crime, the Romans, without consulting the Emperor as they had promised, at once elected Pope Benedict V. Once more Otto appeared before Rome with a huge army to assert his rights and to enforce his policy. The city surrendered, the new Pope begged for mercy, and was banished to Germany. Leo VIII. was recalled. "When I drop my sword, I will drop Leo," boasted the Emperor. The Emperor's sword had come to be the basis of papal power. A Church council was summoned and declared that the Emperor had a full right to the kingdom of Italy, that he could name his successor, and that the election of a Pope must accord with his will. After that great victory Otto returned to Germany, where his approval was soon asked for the election of Leo VIII.'s successor, the respectable John XIII. Again the customary rebellion against the new occupant of St. Peter's chair recalled Otto to Rome. There he

[1] Greenwood, bk. viii., 483.

remained five years and won a distinct victory for both his papal, and his imperial policy.

Otto's foreign policy as Emperor was not unlike that of his great predecessor, Charles the Great, and his renowned successor, Napoleon the Great, namely, to unite the East and the West. The hand of an eastern princess was wooed for himself but without success.[1] His son proved a better lover and married the ambitious Theophano (972).[2] The Empire was extended by conquests. Lotharingia was won without war. The restoration of the West Franks to the Empire was attempted. Burgundy became a vassal kingdom.[3] The Danes, Slavs, and Magyars were held in subjugation. An effort was made by Otto to extend his sway over southern Italy.

Like Charles the Great, Otto gave considerable attention to education. Germany, at that time being on the frontier, was inferior in culture to Italy, Spain, France, and England. Otto, who knew the Frankish and Slavic dialects, attempted to learn Latin late in life. He attracted a number of educated men and celebrated wits to his court such as Widukind, the historian; Ratherius, the theologian; Luitprand, the humourist and diplomat; Gerbert, the omniscient scholar; Archbishop Bruno, Otto's brother and a great classical scholar; and John of Gorz, the grammarian and Bible student.[4] Learning was not appreciated, however, and these scholars were looked upon with jealousy and suspicion.[5]

[1] Henderson, *Select. Hist. Docs.*, 442, gives the highly amusing account of the ambassador Luitprand.

[2] Bryce, ch. 9.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 30, 31.

[4] Maitland, *Dark Ages*, 499.

[5] Hauck, iii., 333. Archbishop Bruno was thought to be in

The resemblances and differences between Otto the Great and Charles the Great were very striking. Both were Teutons—one a Frank, the other a Saxon. Both as kings carved out the foundations for an Empire with the sword. Both were coronated as Emperor at Rome by the Pope and posed as champions of the Church. Both assumed the Italian crown. Both used the same method in propagating Christianity among the heathen on their borders. Both assumed the right to rule the Church from Pope to priest. Both subjected the powerful nobles and established an absolute, personal government, though Otto's position in Germany and Europe was less commanding and less autocratic than his predecessor's. Both produced an intellectual renascence. Both deserve to be called the "Great." But neither their kingdoms nor their Empires were coterminous, though their capitals were identical, namely, Rome and Aachen. Otto's Empire was founded on narrower geographical limits, hence had a less plausible claim to be the heir of Rome's universal dominion. Charles tried one Pope, while Otto deposed two and had his own candidates elected. Otto took more pains to preserve his Empire than Charles. Otto's Empire was less ecclesiastical and also less Roman. Charles ruled all the Franks and Italy, Otto only the Eastern Franks and Italy. Charles ruled over Latin Christendom, while Otto only a portion of it. Charles was head of the "heerban";

league with the devil. William of Hirschau wrote an elaborate apology for classical learning as an appendix to his work on astronomy.

The trick played by Henry II. on Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn illustrates the prevailing ignorance of Latin. Henry II. had "fa" erased from the mass for the dead. The Bishop did not understand Latin so offered up a prayer for he and she mules.—Fisher, *Med. Emp.*, ii., 90.

Otto of a feudal state. Otto produced no great capitularies like Charles. Otto's Empire was less splendid, but more peaceful, prosperous, and lasting, because placed on a better social basis. Otto's own life and court were on a far loftier plane than was true of Charles, yet Charles was both the greater warrior and the greater statesman. The Roman Empire of Charles after one hundred and fifty years was revised as the Holy Roman Empire of Otto. The latter was substantially as well as technically the continuation of the former.

Otto I., before making his journey to Rome in 961, had his son Otto II. crowned King of Germany at Aachen.[1] Six years later (967) he was coronated at Rome as Emperor. He was educated by Ekkehard of St. Gall, the court chaplain, in literature, history, and science, and by Count Huodo in knightly accomplishments. For the age his moral character was exceptionally high and he possessed refined, scholarly tastes. In 971 he married Theophano, a royal princess of the Eastern Empire.[2] When Otto I. died in 973 in the Saxon monastery at Memleben, Otto II., at the age of eighteen, became sole king and Emperor for ten years.

Otto II. continued his father's domestic policy of breaking down the power of the German dukes. In foreign affairs he subdued the rebellious Danes (974), held the Bohemians in check, invaded France and took Lorraine (978), subjected Poland to German rule (979), and attempted to drive the Greeks and Saracens out of southern Italy; but his early death prevented the fulfilling of his threat to reunite Sicily with the Empire.

[1] Uhlriz, *Otto II. und Otto III.; Jahrb. d. Deutsch. Reiches.*

[2] Bryce, ch. 9; Henderson, 442.

His papal policy was a continuation of that of his father. When the papal usurper Boniface VII. imprisoned and strangled Pope John XIII. and then fled with the Church treasures to Constantinople (974), young Otto set Benedict VII. on the chair of St. Peter and assured him a quiet reign for nine years. Upon the Pope's death (983) the youthful Emperor elevated the Bishop of Pavia to the papal throne as John XIV. When Otto II. died at the premature age of twenty-eight in Verona after "a short and troubled reign,"[1] Boniface VII. returned from the East to Rome, murdered the Pope, and reassumed the papal tiara unresisted. The usurper died in eleven months, however, and then the cowardly Romans avenged themselves on his dead body.[2]

Otto II. left behind him a son of three and a very active widow. The young heir to the honours and burdens of the German crown and to the imperial throne likewise had his mind filled with the glorious history of Greece and the Eastern Empire by his Grecian mother. John the Greek inspired within him a love for the classics. Bernard, a German monk, gave him a monastic education which showed itself during the remainder of his life. Gerbert, a Clugniac monk, the greatest scholar of his day, taught him history, literature, rhetoric, and science, and fired him with a holy, ascetic zeal to become a great, just Christian Emperor.

During Otto III.'s minority (983–996) the government was wielded by his mother Theophano (984–991) and his grandmother Adelaid (991–996). At the age of

[1] He was buried in St. Peter's and is the only German Emperor sleeping on Roman soil.

[2] Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, iii., 189; Greenwood, bk. viii., 497.

sixteen the last of the Ottonians, half Saxon and half Greek, the plaything of women, scholars, and monks, the pious young dreamer of a world Empire, started for Rome to be crowned Emperor (996). His father had had him elected king at Verona in 983 and coronated at Aachen. On his way now to the Eternal City, accompanied by a coterie of German nobles and churchmen, he stopped at Pavia to receive the homage of the Lombard princes. At Ravenna a messenger from the Roman clergy, senate, and people announced the death of Pope John XV. and asked Otto to name a successor—a very significant fact. The young ruler appointed his cousin and court chaplain, Bruno, who became the first German Pope. Bruno was only twenty-four, but noted for his piety, austere morals, and fiery temper. He hastened to Rome and was installed with great joy as Gregory V. "The news that a scion of the imperial house, a man of holiness, of wisdom and virtue, is placed upon the chair of Peter," wrote Abbo of Fleury to a friend, "is news more precious than gold and costly stones." [1] This was the first instance where a northerner, a German, was elevated to the See of St. Peter. A few weeks after the papal coronation Otto entered Rome and received the imperial crown from the youthful Pontiff. He held a council to settle Church affairs and called a diet of civil authorities to settle the government and then returned to Germany.

Within a year, however, a rebellion in Rome against Gregory V. recalled Otto III. (997). The Pope had fled to Pavia, called a council, and excommunicated the leader of the insurrection, Crescentius. An anti-Pope

[1] Mabillon, *Act. Ord. St. Benedict*, vi., 30; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 259.

had been elected, John XVI., formerly the Emperor's teacher and a court favourite. Otto reached Rome with a large army, caught the fleeing papal usurper, deposed him, put out his eyes, cut off his nose and ears, and sent him through the streets of Rome on an ass. Crescentius was beheaded, and with him a dozen conspirators.[1] Gregory V. was restored to his dignity only to die within a year (999). As his successor Otto chose Gerbert, his old teacher, who became Sylvester II., the idealist and reformer.[2]

Otto III. was occupied a great deal with dreams about a world Empire. He inherited from his mother the ambition to rule the East and from his father the right to rule the West. His teachers inspired him with a desire to become the Christian Emperor of the world with the Pope as his chief assistant, and coloured his whole career by giving him a monastic view of life. He made frequent visits to sacred shrines where he remained weeks at a time. In Rome he built his palace purposely beside a monastery. The idea of a holy crusade to Jerusalem was in his mind. He felt called upon to reform the Papacy, which he enriched by large grants and strengthened by privileges, and he selected most of his chief officials from the churchmen. He called himself the "servant of Jesus Christ" and the "servant of the Apostle."

After having taken Rome and appointed two Popes, Otto attempted to put his imperial fancies into practice. Rome was made his permanent residence and capital from which to rule the world as "Emperor of the Romans." On the Aventine a great palace was built —a thing not even thought of by Charles the Great.

[1] Milman, ii., 481.

[2] See Chap. XVIII.

The ceremonies of the Byzantine court were introduced —a long retinue of servants, an imperial guard, and a very formal etiquette. The young ruler refused to eat with his nobles and loved to sit proudly on a gaudy throne arrayed in costly purple while his servants meekly satisfied every whim. He likewise aped the Roman Emperors in magnifying the office of patrician and city prefect, by calling himself "Consul" and by thinking of reviving the senate. Dreaming of conquests beyond the seas, he appointed a naval prefect. Germany and Italy were united under one chancellor and each ruled with troops from the other. Germany,[1] Lombardy, Greece, Naples, and the rest of the world were to be reduced to subject provinces of the restored Empire. To receive the sacred sanction of his most renowned predecessor, Charles the Great, for these mighty ideas, Otto III. opened his tomb in the cathedral at Aachen in the year 1000 and from the body of the powerful Teuton carried away holy relics.[2]

Early in 1000 the turbulent Romans broke out in a fresh rebellion and the world Empire was destroyed about as easily as a child's house of blocks. Besieged for three days in his palace, Otto at last addressed the discontented mob in these words:

Are you my Romans? For you I left my country and my friends. For love of you I have sacrificed my Saxons and all the Germans, my blood. I have adopted you as my sons; I have preferred you to all. For you I have had stirred up against me the envy and hatred of all. And now you have rejected your father; you have destroyed my friends by a cruel death; you have excluded me whom

[1] Thacher and McNeal, No. 289.

[2] Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, viii., 273; Mombert, *Charles the Great*, 485.

you should not exclude, because I will never suffer those to be exiled from my affections whom I embrace with paternal love.[1]

Soon he fled from Rome never to return, and tried to raise an army in Germany but failed. The Germans refused to sacrifice their blood and wealth for a useless chimera and even threatened to elect a new king. Then he appealed to Italy for assistance, but Venice alone promised aid and that was small. Otto III.'s universal rule dwindled to the little mountain of Paterno —like Napoleon's St. Helena—and there he died in 1002 in the arms of the faithful Sylvester II. at the age of 22, childless and deserted, and his body was carried over the Alps to rest by the side of Charles the Great. And the youthful Pope survived the young Emperor just a twelvemonth.

The direct line of Otto the Great was at an end. Henry II., the Saint, who was in Otto III.'s service in Rome (1001) and received the royal and imperial insignia at the young Emperor's death pending a new election, claimed the German throne as the next in descent.[2] By satisfactory promises to the lay and secular princes he defeated his rivals and was crowned German King at Mainz (1002).

In his political policy Henry II. followed in the path already formed. He subdued the strong internal foes in Germany, pacified the neighbouring peoples, provided for the union of Burgundy with Germany, assumed the iron crown of Lombardy, and accepted the imperial crown at Rome in 1014. His ecclesiastical policy was very pronounced. He was a devout and ascetic champion of the Papacy and stood stoutly for reforms

[1] Fisher, *Med. Emp.*, ii., 203; Mombert, *Charles the Great.*

[2] Henry II. was the great-grandson of Otto I.

such as the abolition of simony, the denunciation of the marriage of priests and the correction of monastic abuses. He urged the enforcement of these necessary changes through a general council and laboured for peace. In all these endeavours he had the sincere co-operation of Pope Benedict VIII. The bishopric of Bamberg was created during this rule.

Conrad II. (1024–1039) aimed to build up a powerful centralised Germany and through it to rule the Empire. Though compelled to fight formidable internal conspiracies all his life, yet he succeeded in making the crown the recognised and respected authority in Germany. Like Otto I. he used the lesser nobles to curb the power of the greater nobles. He forced obedience to his royal laws everywhere. To perpetuate his rule and to establish the principle of kingly heredity he had his son and heir, Henry III., crowned and coronated at Aachen (1028). Since political power depended largely upon landed wealth Henry III. received both the Duchy of Bavaria (1029) and the Duchy of Swabia (1038).

The foreign policy of Conrad II. was equally wise. He made friends of the powerful King Canute and his Danes by marrying Henry III. to Canute's daughter. The Polish King was reduced to a vassal duke and Bohemia and Lucatia were won back, while the Bulgarians were effectually held in check. He assumed the crown of Burgundy, which became an integral part of Germany (1032) and gave the crown to his son (1038). Early in his rule (1026) Conrad had entered Italy and assumed the iron crown of Lombardy. Then he made his way to Rome in 1027 on Easter day and was there crowned Emperor by Pope John XIX. in the presence of a great multitude of Romans and

Germans. Through the Normans he then extended his imperial sway over southern Italy, but ten years, later he was forced to make a journey to Rome to reconquer that part of his Empire.

In Germany Conrad II. ruled the clergy with a rod of iron, filled bishoprics for purely political ends, and used the Church to build up his royal powers. In Lombardy he won over the clerical party at that time hostile to the Pope, and thus smoothed his march to Rome. In John XIX. he found one of the worst examples of the utter worldliness into which the successors of Peter could degenerate. John XIX. before his election had been only a business man, but he was a brother of the presiding Pontiff Benedict VIII., and a member of the powerful Tusculan family. By dint of money[1] he won the office and in one day was hurried through all the clerical orders and installed into power (1024). Hoping for a powerful ally, John XIX. had invited Conrad II. to Rome. A great Lateran Synod followed the coronation of Conrad II. on Easter day,[2] but apparently nothing was said about reforms in the Church, although badly needed. When Conrad died in 1039 the German Empire had reached its pinnacle of greatness. No sovereign since Charles the Great had exercised such powers, for the German and Italian princes were subject to the imperial crown and the clergy were dependent upon it.

Henry III. (1029–1056) came to the German throne with brighter prospects than any of his predecessors. What a field for an Alexander, a Cæsar, or a Napoleon! What an opportunity to cut Germany loose from the

[1] Glaber, I., i., ch. 4.

[2] Rudolph, King of Burgundy, and Canute, King of England and Denmark were both present at the coronation.

Empire and make her the greatest power in Europe! The Polish monarchy was falling to pieces; Hungary was rent by the pagan and Christian parties; Canute's northern empire had broken down; Italy, chronically subdivided, was awaiting a master; and the young king was also Duke of Bavaria, Franconia, and Swabia. Hindesheim, a contemporary, declared that no one in the Empire mourned the loss of Conrad because such better things were expected of his son, one of the most highly cultured young men of the age.[1]

Henry III. continued the policy of Otto I. by seeking to increase the power of the crown at the expense of the petty rulers. Hence duchies were given to his relatives or to loyal vassals. The lesser nobility and the commons were used to counteract the influence of the lords and princes. His reign, in consequence, was disturbed by no serious insurrections. The border states were subdued—Bohemia in 1041 and Hungary in 1044.[2] To keep the peace and put down feuds the Truce of God was proclaimed in 1041 throughout Germany. All feuds were to cease from Wednesday eve till Monday morning and absolution from sin was the reward for keeping the Truce.[3] Those who purposely broke it were penalised. Burgundy extended it to the periods between Advent and Epiphany, and from Septuagesima to the first Sunday after Easter. Henry III. soon made himself master of Italy and like many a predecessor assumed the iron crown of Lombardy and then established his supremacy over the Normans in the south. Out of a rule of seventeen years he

[1] Steindorff, *Jahrb, d. Deutsch. Reichs unter Heinrich, III.*
[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 32.
[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 242, 243.

spent but sixty-four weeks in Italy. In 1046 he was coronated Emperor at Rome and made Patrician.

Like Charles the Great and Otto the Great Henry III. assumed the headship of the Church. The Papacy, at that time, was a three-headed monster which needed a Hercules to slay it. Benedict IX., another member of the Tusculum family, elected Pope when a boy of eighteen (1033), had led a life of indescribable crime and, in consequence, had been driven from the city (1044) but returned and in 1046 held the Vatican.[1] Sylvester III. was elected anti-Pope when Benedict IX. was driven out and lived in St. Peter's. Gregory VI. literally bought the papal throne of Benedict IX. (1045) for 1000 pounds of silver and bribed the people into approval. He took up his residence at St. Maria Maggiore.[2] Learning of these disorders, Henry III. went to Italy and in 1046 held the Council of Sutri in which Gregory VI. acknowledged his guilt, divested himself of his papal insignia and begged forgiveness. Benedict IX. and Sylvester III. were declared usurpers, simoniacs, and intruders, hence they were deposed. Benedict IX. hid himself for future trouble, Sylvester III. returned to his bishopric and Gregory VI. was sent into exile in Germany. The Bishop of Bamberg, a German, was chosen Pope in a council held in Rome and assumed the title of Clement II. (1046) and immediately coronated Henry III. and his wife with the imperial honours.[3] This is the beginning of a series of German Popes who were to do much to purify and strengthen the Church. Before Henry died three such Popes were elected. Clement II. soon assembled

[1] Schaff, iv., 298; Milman, ii., 505.
[2] Muratori, iii., 2, p. 345; Hefele, iv., 707; Giesbrecht, ii., 643.
[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 57.

a council in Rome to extirpate simony and to that end had several canons enacted. But his reign of less than a year, was too short to accomplish much. Henry III. died in 1056 with his great Empire full of trouble from border wars and rebellious nobles. The Empire was on the wane and his son took up a crown of difficulties.

On Germany the effects of the creation of the Holy Roman Empire were very marked. It established the recognised right of the German King to wear the Italian and imperial crowns and made Aachen, Milan, and Rome the coronation cities. It tended to weaken the allegiance of the Germans to their king when he became Emperor and spent most of his time, together with German wealth and blood, in Italy. It fused the German King and the Roman Emperor into a product different from either and effected the whole subsequent history of both Germany and the Empire. The two systems were very different: one was centralised, the other local; one rested upon a "sublime theory," the other grew out of anarchy; one was ruled by an absolute monarch, the other by a limited monarch; one was based on the equality of all citizens, the other founded on inequality. As a result of the fusion both offices lost and won certain attributes and the product was a "German Emperor" who was the necessary head of feudalism which became so deeply rooted that it took ages to throw it off. To help on the process of disintegration Otto the Great allowed the five great duchies to be subdivided and thus created a second order of nobility and greatly increased the number of nobles. In short Germany was weakened, impoverished, divided, and stunted. The denationalisation of Germany was continued until 1870. What

might not have been the splendid career of Germany, had Otto the Great and his successors devoted their time and talent to the creation of a powerful German national state as did the French and English kings? It must be added, however, that this peculiar relation with Italy opened the way for learning, art, and a more refined civilisation in the North and that, in turn, Germany became the schoolmaster of Poland and Bohemia and perpetuated the language, literature, and law of Rome.

On Italy the Holy Roman Empire left a deep and permanent impression. It gave Italy a long line of foreign rulers who seldom cared much for her real interests and only sought to exploit her for selfish ends. It prevented the establishment of a powerful national state as a republic, or as a monarchy, under some native noble, or a Pope, until 1859. On the contrary it encouraged decentralisation and local division of the people. Italy became the scene, cause, and victim of countless wars and invasions by foreign rulers; or of inumerable local contests which sapped the nation of all strength and ambition.

On the Empire the results were plainly seen. The Empire of the Cæsars and of Charles the Great was revived on a German basis with a German Emperor and kept alive till 1806 when Napoleon dealt it a death-blow. Its earlier extent and later claims were never realised. It was forced into a continual struggle for its existence with the Italian republics and German dukes, with the Papacy, and with the national states of Europe. The three theories about the relation of the world-empire to the world-church received final development.

1. The Holy Empire, or ideal theory, untied the

Church and the state, the cross and the sceptre, to attain their legitimate boundaries, namely, the world. Hence the Papacy and the Empire were but two sides of the same thing and their two heads co-operated to rule the same regions and peoples, but in different spheres. The Pope ruled the souls of men; the Emperor their bodies; but both were necessary, equal, and established by God. It was a confusion of these two powers and ideas that produced such mediæval anachronisms as churchmen who were worldly princes with large estates, who led their flocks to war, and who became the prime ministers of kings; and secular rulers who appointed Church officials and called and presided over councils. This was the theory held by dreamers and theorists, but it was never realised.

2. The papal theory made the Pope alone God's representative on earth and maintained that the Emperor received his right to rule from St. Peter's successor. For historical proof of the genuineness of this position attention was called to the power of the keys, the Donation of Constantine, the coronation of Pepin, the restoration of the Empire in the West. Such figures as the sun and the moon, the body and the soul, etc., were used with telling effect by the clerical party who advanced this theory. It was upheld by Nicholas I., Hildebrand, Alexander III., Innocent III., and culminated with Boniface VIII. at the jubilee of 1300 when, seated on the throne of Constantine, girded with the imperial sword, wearing a crown, and waving a sceptre, he shouted to the throng of loyal pilgrims: "I am Cæsar—I am Emperor."

3. The imperial theory put the Emperor above the Pope as God's vice-regent on earth and reduced the Pope to the position of chief bishop in the Empire. It

was held that historical evidence to support this position could be found in the Jewish theocracy; the words of Jesus and the apostles about civil power; the seniority of the Empire over the Papacy; the attitude of Constantine and later Emperors; the work of Charles the Great, Otto the Great, and their illustrious successors. This theory was defended by the Emperors, kings, civil lawyers, and members of the imperial party.

So far as the Papacy was concerned the Holy Roman Empire created a rival world-ruler with whom for five hundred years the Popes were in almost endless strife. Under powerful rulers like Otto the Great the Papacy was subjected to the Empire more absolutely than in the day of Charles the Great. Under the great German Emperors much was done to reform the Church and to advance its interests and influence in the world. Each Emperor took a coronation oath to defend and protect the Church against heretics, schismatics, infidels, pagans, and all other enemies, and that obligation was as a rule faithfully and loyally kept. But all things considered was the Papacy stronger or weaker, better or worse, for the creation of the Holy Roman Empire? Does the fact that the Papacy declined with the decay and death of the Empire suggest a necessary dependence of the former on the latter?

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—IN ENGLISH: The materials available in English are scarce and very unsatisfactory. A few documents will be found in the following:

1.—Balzani, U., *Early Chronicles of Italy.* Lond., 1883.

2.—Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.*

3.—Ogg, *Source Book of Mediæval History.*

4.—Robinson, *Readings in European History*, i., ch. 12.
5.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History.*
6.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints.*

II.—IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES: The primary sources not in English are very extensive.[1] The chief collections are:

1.—Altmann, W., and Bernheim, E., *Ausgewhätle Urkunden zur Erläuterung der Verfassungsgeschichte Deutschlands im Mittelalter.* Berl., 1891.
2.—Baronius, *Annales*, vols. xiii.–xix. Luca, 1738. 35 vols.
3.—Boehmer, J. F., *Fontes rerum Germanicarum.* Stuttg., 1843–68. 4 vols.
4.—*Die Geschictschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit.* 2d ed. Berl. and Leipz., 1885 *sqq.* 90 vols.
5.—Doeberl, M., *Monumenta Germaniæ selecta ab a. 768 usque ad a. 1250.* Münch., 1889–90.
6.—Jaffé, P., *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum.* Berl., 1864–73. 6 vols. *Regesta Pontificum Romanum* (to 1198). Berl. 1851.
7.—Lehmann, H. O., *Quellen zur Deutschen Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte.* Berl., 1891.
8.—Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, xviii.
9.—Migne, vol. 142. Glaber, *Historia sui temporis.*
10.—Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttum.*
11.—Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores.* Med., 1723–51. 28 vols.
12.—Pertz, et al., *Monumenta Germania Historica*, 1826 *ff.*
13.—Pflugh-Harttung, *Acta Pontificum Romanorum.* Tub., 1881–8. 3 vols.
14.—*Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum.* Hanover, 1840 ff. 42 vols.
15.—Stumpf, K. F., *Die Kaiserkunden des X., XI., und XII., Jahrhunderts Chronologisch verzeichnet.* Innsb., 1865–83.
16.—Waitz, G., *Urkunden zur Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte im 11 und 12 Jahrhundert.* Keil, 1886.

[1] See Potthast, *Wegweiser.*

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Bryce, J., *The Holy Roman Empire.* Rev. ed., 1904.

2.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *The Empire of Charles the Great and His Successors.* Lond., 1894.

3.—Dunning, W. A., *History of Political Theories.* N. Y., 1901. Vol. i.

4.—Emerton, E., *Mediæval Europe.* Bost., 1896.

5.—Fisher, H. A. L., *The Mediæval Empire.* Lond., 1898. 2 vols.

6.—Gierke, O., *Political Theories of the Middle Ages.* Camb., 1900.

7.—Greenwood, A. D., *Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1896.

8.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* Lond., 1859–72. 6 vols.

9.—Gregorovius, F., *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1903. Vol. iii.

10.—Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History.*

11.—Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages.* 2d ed. Lond., 1845.

12.—Oman, C., *The Dark Ages.* Lond., 1898.

13.—Tout, T. F., *The Empire and the Papacy.* Lond., 1898.

14.—Turner, S. E., *Sketch of the Germanic Constitution.* N. Y., 1888. 26–80.

Bibliographical Note:—Some of the best books on this subject are in German. So far no translations have appeared. Among many may be mentioned:—Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit* 1890. 2.—Giesbrecht, W. V., *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit.* Braun., 1895. i.–ii. 6 vols. 3.—Hauck, A., *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.* Leip., 1887–1900. Vol. iii. 4.—*Jahrbücher der Deutschen Geschichte.* Berlin, 1862 ff. 5.—Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* Vol. iii. 6.—Richter, G., and Kohl, H., *Annalen der Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter.* Halle, 1873–90. 7.—Waitz, G.,

Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte. Kiel, 1844 *ff.* 8 vols. 8.—Watterich, *Pontificum romanorum vitæ ab aequalibus conscriptæ.* 1862. 2 vols.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, ch. 7, 8, 10. Alzog, ii., 107–111. Butler, ch. 31, 55–57, 62. Chantrel, ch. 3. Coxe, Lect. 4, sec. 20–25. Crooks, ch. 33. Darrus, ii., 358, 580. Döllinger, iii., ch. 4, sec. 1; ch. 5, sec. 2–3. Fisher, pd. 5, ch. 2; pd. 6, ch. 2. Gibbon, ch. 49. Gieseler §21, 22, 24, 27. Gilmartin, i, 31. Hallam, ch. 1, pt. 1, ch. 3, pt. 1. Hardwick, ch. 4, sec. 2; ch. 10, sec. 2. Hase, sec. 170–192. Hore, ch. 12. Kurtz, i., 436–438, 483–495, ii., 25–52. Milman, bk. 5, ch. 7, 11, 12, 13. Moeller, pd. 2, ch. 2. Mosheim, cent. 9, 10. Neander, pd. 4, §2. Schaff, pd. 4, ch. 4.

CHAPTER XVIII

PREPARATIONS FOR THE HILDEBRANDINE REFORMATION

OUTLINE: I.—Decline of the Papacy after Nicholas I. (858–867). II.—Reform efforts before the time of Hildebrand. III.—The youth and education of Hildebrand. IV.—The Hildebrandine Popes. V.—Sources.

NICHOLAS I., through the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, had raised the Church above the state, made the Pope supreme in the Church, and inaugurated needed reforms.[1] From Nicholas I. to Hildebrand (867–1049), for about two centuries, the Popes as a rule were men of very ordinary ability and education. Many of them gained the papal office by crime, or force, or bribery, and used it for corrupt purposes. Most of the fifty Popes and six anti-Popes of this period were Italians. The chair of St. Peter was far more political and worldly than spiritual. The latter part of the ninth century Rome saw twelve Popes elected in twenty-three years. Hadrian II. (867–872), an ex-married man with a family, connected with many a domestic scandal,[2] succeeded Nicholas I., and defended the papal pretensions with ability and dignity. Then followed John VIII. (872–882), an active,

[1] See Chapter XVI.

[2] The Pope's wife was still living at the time of his election. His daughter, a maiden of forty, was abducted by the son of Bishop Aresenius. When threatened with punishment, the abductor murdered the Pope's wife and daughter. See Schaff, iv., 277.

passionate, shrewd prelate, who was killed by a relative covetous of the papal throne with its wealth and influence. Stephen VI. (896–897) in revenge caused the body of Formosus, his predecessor, to be exhumed, clad in pontifical robes, seated on the pontifical throne, tried by a synod, deposed as a usurper, the fingers with which the pontifical blessing was given cut off, and thrown into the Tiber. He, himself, was cast into prison and there strangled to death (897).

During the tenth century the Papacy was a reflection of the chaotic, anarchistic condition of the state, the demoralisation and depravity of society, and the ignorance, superstition, and crime of the day.[1] The head of the Church had lost all dignity and independence, and the office had become a prey to greed, force, and intrigue. Most of the Popes ended their careers in deposition, prison, or murder. The Marquises of Tuscany and the Counts of Tusculum ruled the city of Rome and dictated the election of Popes for more than half a century. Three bold, beautiful, wealthy Roman women,—Theodora and her two daughters—Marozia and Theodora—filled the chair of St. Peter with their lovers and their bastards.[2] This period has been given the significant name of pornocracy. John X. (914–928), the first warrior-Pope, lead an army against the Saracens and defeated them. He was imprisoned and murdered by the wicked Marozia (928). John XII. (955–963) was governor of Rome and frequently appeared dressed as a soldier.[3] The Papacy was openly bought and sold for money.

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 245.

[2] Alzog, ii., §187; Hefele, iv., 575; Gregorovius, iii., 282; P v., 297; Migne, vol. 136, 827, 852; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 251.

[3] See Chapter XVII.

Benedict VIII. and John XIX. were both indebted for their elevation to acknowledged bribery, and the latter was only a layman when elected but in one day passed through all the requisite clerical degrees and thus qualified for the high office. The most conspicuous case was that of Gregory VI. who paid one thousand pounds in silver for the empty honour.[1] The office of the Papacy practically became hereditary. Laymen as well as churchmen were elected. Benedict IX. (1033–1045) ascended the papal throne at the age of ten and thought of marrying in order to transmit his infamous rule.[2]

The higher clergy in this period of disorder were for the most part secular princes. They ruled large tracts of land, possessed and exercised royal prerogatives, and were granted immunities and privileges such as market rights, coinage, tolls, feudal judicature, etc. Furthermore they assumed secular titles and offices. The leading statesmen of the day were chosen from the clergy. Louis the Infant made the Abbot of Corvey a count (900), and gave the Bishop of Tours the same title (902). Henry I. made the Bishop of Tule also the Duke of Tule (928).[3] Otto I. gave his own brother, the Archbishop of Köln, the duchy of Lorraine and made him Count of Brandenburg and Magdeburg. Otto III. and Henry III. also made many such grants to churchmen. These higher clergy were married in many cases, or lived with mistresses, and had families.

[1] See Chapter XVII.

[2] Jaffé, 50; Hefele, iv., 707.

[3] Bömer, *Regesta*, v., 3. See Hauck, iii., 57–59. But it must be remembered that among these wicked Popes there appeared here and there a Pope distinguished for purity of life. Such were John IX. (898–900), Benedict IV. (900–903), Anastasius III. (911–913), Leo VI. (928–929).

After the time of Otto I. they began to counteract the power of the nobles, hence they were made more and more dependent upon kings, who claimed the right to appoint them, who invested them with their power, and to whom they swore allegiance. They appeared at the court of the king like nobles, and in the event of war led their troops in person to the battlefield. Depositions for alleged disloyalty were very common. As the bishops became more involved in secular affairs they naturally neglected their spiritual duties. Simony crept in as a consequence and was shamefully practised. Often the worst fitted instead of the best prepared persons were given the coveted sinecures. It was but natural that the moral example set by the Pope should reveal itself in the lives of the clergy.

Greedy hands were raised against the monasteries, and their rich lands were frequently given as fiefs to laymen.[1] The abbots began to strive for worldly reputation and power. Hence the old discipline was neglected, and disorders and excesses of all kinds prevailed among the monks and nuns.[2] The common priests and monks were probably better as a rule than either Popes or bishops, still in too many cases they were prone to follow the example set by their superiors. The laity were undoubtedly on a lower moral and intellectual plane than the priesthood.[3] Consequently few complaints were made by them against the sins and crimes of Popes, bishops, abbots, and priests. The denunciation of flagrant abuses and the cry for reform, as far as there was any, came from the better clergy. Of the eighty councils held in France during the eleventh

[1] Gieseler, ii., 332.
[2] Mansi, xviii., 270.
[3] Alzog, ii., §200.

century, every one denounced the lawlessness of the laity and the unchastity and simony of the clergy.[1]

The manifold corruptions of the tenth century and the first part of the eleventh produced a clergy that had almost forfeited its spiritual character. Religion was a cloak for immorality, for licentious self-indulgence, and for corruption and venality which can scarcely be equalled in the entire history of the Christian Church. It was a matter of common notoriety that France and Germany were addicted, almost equal to Italy, to a shameless traffic in ecclesiastical offices and preferments.

The most startling picture of the condition of the clergy comes from the pen of Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino, who later became Pope Victor III.:

> The Italian priesthood, and among them most conspicuously the Roman pontiffs, are in the habit of defying all law and all authority; thus utterly confounding together things sacred and profane. During all this time the Italian priesthood, and none more conspicuously than the Roman pontiffs, set at naught all ecclesiastical law and authority. The people sold their suffrages for money to the highest bidder; the clergy, moved and seduced by avarice and ambition, bought and sold the sacred rights of ordination, and carried on a gigantic traffic with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Few prelates remained untainted with the vile pollution of simony; few, very few, kept the commandments of God, or served him with upright hearts; following their chiefs to do evil, the great sacerdotal herd rushed headlong down the precipice into the quagmire of licentiousness and profligacy: priests and deacons, whose duty it was to serve God with clean hands, and with chaste bodies to administer the sacraments of the Lord, took to themselves wives after the manner of the laity; they left families behind them, and bequeathed

[1] Alzog, ii., §200.

their ill-gotten wealth to their children; yea, even bishops, in contempt of all shame and decency, dwelt with their wives under the same roof—a nefarious and execrable custom, prevailing, alas! most commonly in that city where the laws, thus shamefully set at naught, first issued from the sacred lips of the Prince of the Apostles and his holy successors.[1]

When Otto III., the last of the Saxon Emperors, died, the Papacy had become, apparently, merged in the state. The initiative of the Pope in all important matters seemed to flow from imperial rather than pontifical prerogative. The arbitrary erection of all sorts of ecclesiastical foundations, the unquestioned secular appointment to the highest offices in the Church, and the legislation by the state in ecclesiastical affairs, all point to a closer fusion of the two powers than since the year 476. But there was no deliberate intention to encroach upon ecclesiastical right. The alliance was reciprocally advantageous. There could be no Emperor without a Pope, and no Pope without an Emperor. The causes for this ascendancy of the temporal power were: (1) the decay of ecclesiastical organisation and discipline; (2) the disruption of society and the confusion of political matters in Italy and Europe generally; (3) the rise of the power and ambition of the German sovereigns; (4) the social demoralisation of the age—the wide-spread incontinence, perjury, venality, rapine, bribery, theft, and murder which infected the Church to its heart's core. Until these humiliating and devitalising forces were remedied, the Church could not hope to attain independence.[2]

Several distinct efforts at reform were made before

[1] Greenwood, bk. ix., ch. 3.
[2] *Ibid.*, bk. x., ch. 1.

the time of Hildebrand, first by the German Emperors and secondly by the German Popes. Henry the Fowler (918–936) declared that he would abolish simony but failed to do so. Otto the Great (936–973) deposed the criminal Pope John XII., elected Leo VIII. in his place, and honestly intended to improve the Papacy. Otto III. (983–1002), a great religious enthusiast, desired to reform the Church through good Popes. Hence he chose Bruno, a man of piety and morality, as the first German Pope, and then appointed Gerbert renowned for sanctity and learning. Henry II., called the Saint (1002–1024), was the first genuine imperial reformer. He opened a campaign in Germany against simony and the marriage of the clergy. He reformed the monasteries by destroying or uniting small monasteries, by abolishing abuses, and by confiscating lands. With the King of France he agreed to hold a great council at Pavia to cure the evils in the Church both north and south of the Alps (1023). Notwithstanding these efforts little real reform was accomplished. Henry III. (1039–1056), thoroughly imbued with Clugniac zeal for reformation, had Leo IX. hold a big synod at Mainz (1049) in which simony was denounced, marriage of the clergy condemned, and local prelates ordered to abolish both evils. Personally this ruler was wholly free from simony and waged an unrelenting war against the abuse both in Italy and in Germany.[1] He deposed three bishops for sins and crimes. He appointed a series of Clugniac puritans to the papal chair[2] and thus paved the way for Hildebrand.

[1] Read his address to the Council of Pavia in Fisher, *Mediæval Empire*, ii., 68. *Cf.* Greenwood, bk. ix., ch. 3, 4.

[2] Clement II., Damascus II., Leo IX., Victor II. Thatcher and McNeal, No. 57.

The German Popes were very active in reformatory efforts. Gregory V. (996–999), who was Bruno[1] of the royal house of Germany, appointed by Otto II., renowned for piety and of unblemished character, assumed a lofty, dignified attitude as Pope and soon made his power felt in Europe. He purified the papal court as far as possible and suppressed the independence of the French clergy, but died too soon to realise his hopes of reformation.

Gerbert, or Sylvester II. (999–1003),[2] born of poor parents, was educated as a teacher first in the Clugniac cloister of Aurillac and then taken by Count Borrel of Barcelona to Spain, where he studied mathematics and the natural sciences in the Mohammedan schools. There Bishop Hatto took a fancy to him and invited him to go to Rome where Pope John XIII. noticed him and recommended him to Otto the Great (971). The Emperor sent him to Rheims to be instructed in logic (972). The Archbishop Adelbert of Rheims soon made him a teacher in the cathedral school. There he taught the writings of Aristotle, the Latin classics, and the sciences. Boethius was his favourite author and science his "darling study." He had many pupils from far and near and gained great fame for his scholarship.[3]

In those days nearly every great man was drawn into the Church, not alone because his services were needed, but also for the reason that in that field were the greatest opportunities for advancement. Otto III., therefore, made Gerbert Abbot of Gabbia, but he soon resigned the position (982). Nine years later he was

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 259.
[2] Migne, vol. 139, p. 85; Ollaris *Œuvres de Gerbert.*
[3] *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, ii., 561.

chosen Archbishop of Rheims (991).[1] In this new office he was kept very busy. He had a council pass an edict which was practically a declaration of independence.[2] He formed a confession of faith which was not considered orthodox.[3] His severe code of morals offended the looser clergy and aroused the jealousy of others. Consequently a party was organised against him composed of the clergy, Emperor, and Pope; and the papal legate held a court in Germany which deprived him of his episcopal functions.[4] Thus driven from office, he joined the court of Otto III. to cast his spell over that young idealist. In 996 he went with him down to Italy where he was soon elevated to the Archbishopric of Ravenna and invested with the insignia of his office by Gregory V. (998). Upon the death of Gregory V., in 999 Otto III. elevated him to that important office[5] as Sylvester II. He surrendered his heretical ideas and became the great forerunner of Hildebrand in attacking simony, in denouncing clerical abuses, in subjecting the higher clergy to his will, and in compelling obedience from the secular powers. To Stephen of Hungary he gave a king's crown and made him primate (1000).[6] He suggested the crusades and laboured with Otto III. for the realisation of the world Empire. After his death in 1003 he soon became the subject of all sort of wild legends.

Benedict VIII. (1012–1024) was elevated to the Papacy as a reform Pope by Henry II. and the German party, though he was not a German. He belonged

[1] *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, iii., 658.
[2] Milman, ii., 491.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] Milman, ii., 493; Schaff, iv., 290.
[5] Milman, ii., 496.
[6] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 56.

to the Clugniac reform party and was a brave, independent Pope who joined the Emperor in assailing simony and in sanctioning the celibacy of the clergy. Clement II. (1046–1047) was made Pope by Henry III. after deposing three rival Popes. He held a Roman synod which condemned simony for the future, forbade the practice by churchmen, made the penalty for disobedience excommunication, and endeavoured to eradicate the evil in Italy and Germany.[1]

The reform efforts of the Popes were supplemented by the reforming monastic orders. St. Nilus (910–1005), a Greek born in Calabria, after his wife's death in 940 entered the monastery of St. Mercurius, where he soon gained renown for his tortures, piety, and studies. Becoming disgusted with the monastic practices, he left the convent and wandered about as a hermit, taking St. Anthony as his model. His fame soon spread abroad so that when he made a pilgrimage to Rome he was greatly honoured there and even consulted by Gregory V. and Otto III. It was not long before he gained a large following of ascetics in Italy and with them founded several cloisters which were models of lofty zeal and piety.[2]

Another monk of this period imbued with the desire for reformation within the Church was St. Dunstan (924–988), the son of a West Saxon noble, educated in the monastic school of Glastonbury, and trained at court.[3] He early adopted the life of a monk, became a hermit, studied the Scriptures and made bells, and

[1] Mansi, xix., 625.

[2] Migne, vol. 120, p. 9–166; *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, iv., 616; Neander, iii., 420; Butler, *Lives of the Saints.*

[3] Hook, *Lives of Archbishops of Canterbury;* Green, *Conquest of England; Dictionary of National Biography;* Milman, bk. viii., ch. 1; Butler, *Lives of the Saints;* Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.*

was given to prayers and visions. Appointed Abbot of Glastonbury in 945, he began to reform the monastic life by restoring the early purity and simplicity. Becoming too much absorbed in the politics of his day and thereby coming under the displeasure of the king, he was banished to Flanders in 956 where he first learned of St. Benedict's rule. Two years later, however, he was recalled to England and soon appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. Then he went to Rome to receive the pallium and, returning to his native land, put himself at the head of the reform party. He sought to replace the seculars by monks, to introduce the Benedictine rule, to enforce celibacy, to prevent concubinage, to require all priests to learn trades, and to forbid the clergy to hunt, hawk, play dice, get drunk, and scold.

The monastery of Clugny grew out of the urgent need of monastic reform. It was founded in 910 by Duke William of Aquitaine to honour Peter and Paul and was put under the immediate control and direction of the Pope.[1] Bruno (d. 927) was made the first abbot. He was a Burgundian who had already gained renown as a monastic leader. A modified St. Benedict's rule was introduced into the new monastery which absolutely forbade the possession of private property, prohibited the eating of quadrupeds, enforced a silence which resulted in the development of a sign language, required psalm singing and Bible reading, and demanded unquestioned obedience. Before Bruno's death six cloisters had been founded. Odo (927–941), a pupil and follower of Bruno, succeeded him.[2] He was a man of great energy and unusual spirituality, and

[1] Henderson, 329; Ogg, §42.

[2] Maitland, *Dark Ages*.

outlined the literary work of the order. From Pope John XI. he obtained the permit to unite more cloisters under his rule and to accept monks from unreformed monasteries. Before his death he had restored the ancient cloister life in countless monasteries over France and in Italy. Under succeeding abbots, Aymar (941–948), Majola (948–994), Odilo (994–1048), and Hugh (1048–1109), reforms were extended to German cloisters and to English monasteries; social and economic reformatory results were produced; the Truce of God was promulgated; and the reform spirit was spread throughout the Church, particularly in reference to simony, celibacy, and concubinage, and uncanonical marriage of the laity. At its height Clugny ruled over two thousand monasteries and produced such Popes as Hildebrand, Urban II., and Pascal II. After the thirteenth century the order began to decline and finally the French Revolution swept it out of existence.[1]

The Camaldolites grew out of an Italian reform movement independent of Clugny though no doubt related to it.[2] It came into existence at the end of the tenth century when the Clugniac movement had already reformed many of the Italian monasteries. The fundamental idea of this order was to reform the monastic evils of Italy by reviving the strictest form of ascetic life. The hermit, Simeon, St. Dominicus of Foligno, and St. Nilus were worthy, inspiring examples. Traditions of the Greek monastic fathers still lingered in southern Italy and in the Apennines land may have had some influence. St. Romould, born at

[1] Duckett, *Charters and Records Illust. of the Eng. Foundations of the Ancient Abbey of Clugny* (1077–1534).

[2] Migne, vol. 144, p. 953; Mabillon, iii., iv.

Ravenna in 950 of a rich noble family, was the real founder. After leading a gay youth, at the age of twenty, he entered a Benedictine monastery to atone for his father's sin in murdering a relative, which crime he witnessed with his own eyes. He intended to remain only forty days but stayed three years, yet found no peace for his soul. Then he turned hermit, practised the severest tortures to defeat the devil, travelled from place to place, gained great fame, had a crowd of followers wherever he went, organised them and appointed a leader, and then moved on to a new field of labour. As his life drew near its close, he retired to Camaldoli in the Apennines, and hence the name of the place was given to his order (1018). To govern these little bands St. Benedict's rule, modified by eastern asceticism, was used. The monks lived in single cells, but had a common meeting place for worship and for eating. Wine and meat were forbidden, and all days except Thursday and Sunday were fast days. The monks were barefooted and went about in silence with hair and beard uncut, performing the duties of farmers and makers of nets and baskets. Some of the more ascetic lived for years without leaving their cells. They were the first to use assistants as servants. St. Romould had a great influence on his age and was called a prophet and a miracle worker. He induced men like the Doge of Venice to take up the monastic life and was visited by the young Otto III. (999). He sent missionaries to Russia and Poland, and went himself to Hungary with twenty-four monks, but was compelled by illness to return to Italy. He preached with great power against the immoral, simoniacal, and wicked clergy, the monastic abuses, simony, and the marriage of churchmen. After his death in 1027,

his work was carried on by his disciples and the order has lived on through the varying vicissitudes of succeeding centuries.[1]

The Vallombrosians originated in Tuscany in 1040 as an outgrowth of the Camaldolian reform movement. St. John Gualbert, the scion of a noble Florentine family, was the founder. Sent by his father to kill the murderer of his brother, he spared his life, when he made the sign of the cross with his arms. On his return to Florence, entering the little Church of San Miniato to pray before an image of Jesus, the figure nodded its head in approval of his act of mercy. As a result in 1038 he became a monk and soon joined St. Romould. Two years later he determined to found an order of his own at Vallombrosa. Followers enough came to begin his organisation and they were put under St. Benedict's rule modified to meet his ideas. Candidates were put on a year's probation and members were divided into three classes,—the religious, the serving brethren, and the laity. When he died in 1073, seven cloisters had been established in Italy, and when the founder was made a saint in 1193 they numbered sixty.

The monastery of Hirshau was established in the Black Forest of Germany.[2] William of Bavaria began the reformation there in 1065 by freeing the monastery from secular control, drawing up a constitution for it on reform lines, patterning its policy after the Clugniac movement, and introducing lay brethren. From Hirshau reformation spread over a large part of Ger-

[1] Mabillon, *Ann. Ord. Benedict.*, iii., iv., gives his life by Peter Damiani; Sachur, *Die Cluniozenser bis zur Mitte des 11th Jahrh.*; Heimbucher, *Die Orden u. Kongregat. der Kath. Kirche.*

[2] *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, xii., 209.

many, and these reform cloisters strongly supported the lofty programme of Gregory VII.[1]

Peter Damiani was born in Ravenna of poor parents in 1006 and early left an orphan. As a boy he had a hard life, but was educated by a brother at Ravenna, Faenza, and Parma. Then he became a teacher and gained wealth and fame as an instructor in grammar and rhetoric at Ravenna. Suddenly at the age of twenty-nine resolving to become a monk, he entered a monastery at Fonte Avellano where he excelled the old monks in intemperate tortures, studied the Scriptures and preached, and wrote a biography of St. Romould. At the age of thirty-seven he was chosen abbot and then introduced St. Romould's Benedictine rule, which made fasting and torture a regular system. Each psalm was to be recited accompanied by one hundred lashes on the bare back and the whole psalter with one thousand five hundred lashes. This practice soon became a regular craze and was taken up later by the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Flagellants. He permitted his monks to read the Scriptures and the Fathers, encouraged them in performing hand work, but cut them off wholly from the world. He soon became the recognised leader of the reform party in Europe. He denounced his age as worse than that of Sodom and Gomorrah; demanded a reformation of monasteries, of all the clergy, and of the Church in general; dedicated his life to a crusade against simony and marriage of the clergy; and condemned in the clergy the practice of bearing arms as Leo IX. did in driving back the Normans (1053). Damiani was too big a man to remain in obscurity, hence he became

[1] Giseke, *Die Hirschauer wärend des Investtiurstreites*, 1883.

Bishop of Ostia and in 1058 was made Cardinal. In the papal court he was a very prominent personage, serving as legate on many an important mission, and in 1061 was almost chosen Pope. He was the spiritual counsellor and censor of seven Hildebrandine popes, and called himself the "Lord of the Pope" and Hildebrand's "Holy Satan." He won the confidence of Henry III. and exercised great control over Henry IV. He died in 1072 just a year before Hildebrand became Pope.[1]

Next to Peter Damiani both in time and importance comes Hildebrand. From the scanty sources concerning his youth it is known that he was born in Tuscany at Saona about 1020 of parents in humble circumstances. His father's name was Bonizo, but whether he was of Teutonic or Roman race, or whether his occupation was that of a carpenter, a farmer, or a goatherd, are unsettled questions. His mother is unknown, but she had a brother who was Abbot of St. Mary's on the Aventine in Rome and one of the twenty churchmen who helped the Pope celebrate mass. To that uncle's monastery in the Eternal City young Hildebrand was early sent and there studied Latin, rhetoric, mathematics, music, dialectics, and the Church Fathers. There too he became imbued with the venerableness of Holy Rome and the sacred authority of the Chair of St. Peter, so that in the stormy days of his old age he could write that St. Peter had nourished him from childhood. Under these surroundings it was but natural that he should decide to be a monk. Soon he was driven to ascetic severities, probably by the corruptions and abuses thrust upon him from all sides.

[1] Migne, vol. 144, p. 145; Vagler, *Peter Damiani;* Neukirch; *Das Leben des Peter Damiani;* Neander, iii., 382, 397; Hefele, iv.; Cooper, *Flagellation and the Flagellants;* Schaff, iv., 787.

In this monastery he met such men as Odilo, Abbot of Clugny, leader of the reform movement in France, who was accustomed to make St. Mary's his stopping place when in Rome; Archbishop Laurentius of Amalfi, who may have taught him the classics; and Archpresbyter John Gratian, a teacher in St. Mary's, who later purchased the papal crown and became Pope Gregory VI.

Abbot Odilo, favourably impressed with the young monk's ability and piety, took him to Clugny, where he completed his studies, practised the severe discipline of the Benedictines, and became grave and puritanical. The life of a monk probably affected Hildebrand as later it did Luther. He seems to have travelled some in Germany—perhaps even visited the court of Henry III. for his order. He may have completed his novitiate at Clugny. From this reform atmosphere Hildebrand returned to Rome when three Popes were claiming the apostolic seat and the Papacy was in its depths of humiliation. Gregory VI., one of the trio, Hildebrand's old teacher, who had bought the office for 1000 pounds in silver, made the young monk his chaplain. Soon he saw the German Emperor, Henry III., come to Rome, hold a council, depose the three Popes, exile his master to a German monastery, and in 1046 elect a new Pontiff. True to his unfortunate friend, Hildebrand followed him to Germany to see him die in 1048 of a broken heart and then, apparently, he returned to Clugny.[1]

Pope Clement II., raised to the papal chair by Henry III. (1046), died within a year and Damasus II. followed him in twenty-three days. The Roman people then prayed the Emperor to name a new papal sovereign and he chose his cousin Bruno Pope in the Diet of Worms

[1] *Cf.* Greenwood, bk. ix., ch. 4.

in 1048 and had him assume the pontifical insignia. This was a new method of election and certainly a dangerous precedent. Bruno was a German, born at Alsace in 1002, well educated and at twenty-four elected Bishop of Toul. He joined the Clugniac reform party and enforced reformation in his diocese. He served the German king on several delicate secular missions, particularly to Burgundy and France, and gained a reputation as a good, clever, honest, brave, devout man. When elected to this high office he was a matured man, handsome, tall and stately, with a strong frank face, and was a general favourite. As a pilgrim he had often gone to Rome and was familiar with the conditions there. His biographer said of the times: "The World lay in wickedness; holiness had disappeared; justice had perished; truth had been buried; Simon Magnus lorded it over the Church, whose bishops and persist were given to luxury and fornication."[1] In Rome the churches were neglected and in ruins, sheep and cattle went in and out of the broken doors, and the monks and clergy were steeped in immorality.[2]

Bruno asked Hildebrand, who appears to have been at the Diet of Worms, to go with him to Rome, but that austere monk replied, "I cannot accompany you because, without canonical institution, and by the royal and secular power alone, you are going to seize upon the Roman Church." If that statement is correct, it shows Hildebrand's ideas of the relation of Church and state twenty-five years before he became Pope. Bruno was persuaded, put off the papal robes, and declared that he would not accept the papal crown

[1] Bruno, *Vita S. Leonis IX.*
[2] Mansi, xix., 705.

save by the free election of the Roman clergy and people. Then the two started for Rome as barefooted pilgrims and many a legendary tale has grown up about that journey, which took two months. At length reaching Rome, these two pious churchmen were heartily welcomed by the Romans and Bruno was chosen Pope in a great gathering in 1049 and coronated as Leo IX.

With Leo IX. began that new policy of reformation and purification of which Hildebrand was the genius and Innocent III. executor. The spirit of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and of Clugny were to be united and to predominate. To reform the curia was the first step of the new Pope. He did this by surrounding himself with good men like Hildebrand, Peter Damiani, Cardinal Humbert, and Archbishop Halimand of Lyons. His next move was to abolish the flagrant evils in the Church such as simony, the violation of celibacy, unjust tithing of the laity, uncanonical marriages of the laity, and lay investiture. These various reforms were to be inaugurated through Church synods, such as the annual Easter synods in Rome, national synods, and local synods. Leo IX. presided over eleven of these synods in person and travelled incessantly through Italy, France, and Germany to enforce the reforms, to root out heresy, to settle disputes, to make appointments, and to manage Church affairs. To enforce his measures in southern Italy he led an army of Italians and Germans against the Normans in 1053, but was defeated and taken prisoner, whereupon he put all the Normans under the ban. They begged their sacred captive to remove the dreaded curse but he refused until they should kiss his feet and recognise the rights of the Church. When he died in 1054,

beloved by all Christendom, he had accomplished more in the way of reformation than any Pope since Nicholas I. and he left behind him a new religious enthusiasm soon to be felt all over Europe.[1]

Leo IX. had entrusted papal affairs to Hildebrand until a new Pope should be elected, hence all eyes were on him and his friends wanted to make him Supreme Pontiff. But he saw the time was not ripe for his work and refused. Hildebrand then headed a delegation to ask the Emperor Henry III. to confirm the nomination of Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstädt, a friend and relative. After the imperial nomination at Mainz, Gebhard went to Rome, was there elected in due canonical form as Pope Victor II. (1055), and immediately took up Hildebrand's sweeping reform policy.[2] Formerly he had advocated a national Church and was a master of Clugniac politics. Now, however, he accepted the papal theory in its entirety. With the Emperor he held a council at Florence which forbade the alienation of Church property, enacted rules of discipline, and determined matters of doctrine.[3] To cure abuses of the French clergy he sent Hildebrand to France, who succeeded in humbling the bishops guilty of simony.[4] Victor II. himself held a council at Tours to discuss the imperial claims of Ferdinand the Great of Spain and Henry III. of Germany, thus assuming that it was his prerogative to act in the capacity of arbiter. He went to Germany in 1056 to see Henry III. die, to hold the centrifugal forces in check in behalf of Henry IV., and to thwart the ambition of

[1] A large number of legends soon sprang up about Leo IX.
[2] Bonizo, ii., 804; Muratori, iv., 403.
[3] Harduin, vi., 1039.
[4] *Ibid.*, Bonizo, 806.

Mamno of Cologne and Adelbert of Bremen to establish a northern patriarchate. The following year he returned to Italy and there soon died (1057), beloved throughout all Christendom.

Five days after the death of Victor II. the Romans, not waiting for the return of Hildebrand, who was still absent on papal business, chose Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine Pope and jubilantly inaugurated him (Aug. 2, 1057). The new Pontiff, who took the name of Stephen IX., was an old enemy of Henry III., had been made Cardinal and Chancellor by Leo IX., had been sent to Constantinople to heal the breach between the East and the West (1054), and had been appointed Abbot of Monte Casino (1057).[1] Since he was elected without the consent of the German imperial party, Hildebrand, elevated to the dignity of cardinal-archdeacon, was sent north to appease the Queen Regent. Stephen IX. manifested his sincere desire to carry forward the work of reformation. Allied with him to accomplish this work were Hildebrand, the greatest man in Rome, and Damiani, the leader of the reform party, whom he appointed Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia. This trio no doubt would have made great headway in the reform propagandism had not the Pope died so soon (Mar. 29, 1058). Before death stilled his tongue, however, he made his court promise not to elect a successor without the advice of Hildebrand, who was still absent in Germany.

The party of nobles in Rome, not heeding the wishes of Stephen IX., immediately elected as Pope Benedict X., and every friend of reform was driven from the city. Hildebrand upon returning to Rome secured

[1] Greenwood, bk. x., ch. 1, p. 156.

the elevation of Gerhard, Bishop of Florence, to the papal chair and inaugurated him without difficulty, whereupon Benedict X. surrendered and was pardoned, though degraded and confined for life within the precincts of St. Maria Maggiore.[1] The new Pope, Nicholas II., practically allowed Hildebrand to dictate his policy. First he sought to free the Church from imperial domination and to elevate it above the state. The death of Henry III. (1056) and the coronation of his son of six as Henry IV. removed a powerful barrier to that object. Germany was divided into an imperial and anti-imperial party. In this condition Italian influence could be used as the determining factor in German politics, hence the states of Italy were forced to recognise the over-sovereignty of the Pope.

In the next place Nicholas II. endeavoured to regulate the papal elections so as to prevent a repetition of the election of Benedict X. and at the same time to eliminate the influence of the Emperor. The Lateran Council held April 13, 1059, attended by the Pope and one hundred and thirteen bishops,[2] many abbots, and a vast concourse of priests and deacons, after condemning Benedict X., prohibiting simony, denouncing lay investiture, and decreeing celibacy to be the law of the Church, created the College of Cardinals.[3] The election of the Pope was now put into the hands of the Roman cardinal-bishops,[4] who were to submit their nominee to the lower clergy and the people for approval.

[1] Greenwood, bk. x., ch. 1, p. 160.

[2] Henderson, 361.

[3] Mansi, xix., 898.

[4] Bowden, i., 200; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 59; Henderson, 361; Alzog, §190.

This practically excluded both the Roman nobles and the Roman Emperor. This edict was the greatest revolution ever attempted in the hierarchy. It was an effort to give the Papacy a constitution which would make it independent. An election by any hands but the cardinals' could now be called unconstitutional or uncanonical. And any person who attempted to resist or impugn the regulation was to be smitten with an awful curse :

> Let him be damned by anathema and excommunication, and be counted among the impious in the resurrection of condemnation; may the wrath of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and the fury of the Apostles Peter and Paul, whose Church he shall dare to disturb, be poured out upon him in this life and in the life to come; may his habitation be made desolate, so that there may be none to inhabit his tents; may his children be made orphans, and his wife a widow; he and his sons; and may he beg his bread, and be driven out of his habitation; may the usurer consume his substance, and the stranger reap the fruit of his labours; may the world be at war with him, and all the elements array themselves against him; and may the merits of all the saints at rest confound him, and even in this life hold the sword of vengeance suspended over him.[1]

The history of the cardinals is very interesting. The word cardinal seems to come from *cardo*, a hinge, and contains the idea of principal or important.[2] The term was early applied to the priests of the first dioceses in Rome and in 308 there were twenty-five in the Eternal City. Under Gregory I. (604) the word was plainly and commonly used. Stephen IV. in 771 extended the title to suburban dioceses. Anastasius' life of Leo

[1] Greenwood, bk. x., ch. 1, pp. 162, 163.
[2] Alzog, §194.

III. (died 816) seems to indicate the germs of a College of Cardinals. It was not, however, until the time of Nicholas II. that the institution was definitely created. The number of cardinals varied greatly—thirty in the twelfth century, seven in the thirteenth century, twenty-four by the act of the Council of Basle, thirteen in 1516, seventy-six in 1559, and finally Sixtus V. fixed the number once for all at seventy to correspond with the seventy elders of Israel.[1] The number, however, was seldom complete.

The paternal solicitude and indefatigable labours of Nicholas II. for the restoration and maintenance of the unity and authority of the Church met with unexpected success. All western Europe, even distant countries like Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Iceland, felt the firm hand of this strong Pope. In Milan Peter Damiani humbled the mighty archbishop and lesser ecclesiastics to repentance for simony and immorality. Robert Guiscard, King of the Normans, acknowledged papal suzerainty.[2] From many standpoints he must be accounted the greatest Pope between Gregory the Great and Gregory VII.

The death of Nicholas II. (1061) gave the College of Cardinals an opportunity to employ the new method of electing the Pope. Hildebrand first sent Cardinal Stephen as a messenger to the Empress Regent to secure her approval of the election, but she refused to receive him because she felt that the royal prerogatives had been encroached upon by the Lateran Council and besides she hoped to carry out her own plans of election. Hildebrand, after waiting some time, resolved to take the initiative and summoned the College of Cardinals.

[1] Bull *Postquam*, 1585.
[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 58.

The right of the young king was tacitly waived and a new Pope called Alexander II. elected. The Empress called a counter-council at Basle in which the regulation creating the College of Cardinals was revoked, the election of Alexander II. was declared null, and in his place the Bishop of Parma was made Pope Honorius II. The German Pope attempted to take Rome by force (April, 1062), did gain an entry, but was soon defeated by Godfrey of Tuscany and forced to flee. A civil revolt in Germany soon led to the recognition of Alexander II. and the Empress Regent sought absolution from him and shortly afterwards entered a Roman convent. The continued quarrel between these two rival claimants of St. Peter's Seat gave a momentary check to reformation in the Church. But the battle over papal election had been won. The Church was no longer ruled by the state. Truly could it be said of Hildebrand "he found the Church a handmaid and left her free." The contest over simony, lay investiture, and celibacy, however, remained to be carried on by the great successor of Alexander II. It was this same Pope Alexander II. who gave William of Normandy the right to assume the crown of England, for which he exacted a yearly tribute. He also appointed the archbishops for England. Lanfranc of Canterbury ably seconded the reformatory exertions of the Pope and set himself firmly against the sale of benefices and the unchastity of the clergy. Nicholas II. likewise declared that papal bulls had the same force as acts of councils—the first expression of that kind. Peter Damiani was sent into France to correct the morals of the clergy and to enforce discipline in the Church. Later he made a similar trip to Germany. Had not death claimed Nicholas so soon (Apr. 21, 1073)

he would probably have carried out his intentions to reform the wicked young German king, who was called to Rome to answer for his conduct, and to punish his councillors, whom he did excommunicate. He bequeathed that difficult work, however, to one more able than he for its accomplishment.

Charles the Great and Otto the Great both called councils in Rome to try Popes. But now the Pope has attained such a pre-eminence that he cites the Emperor to appear before him to justify his conduct. Verily the Papacy, with the aid of Damiani and Hildebrand, had got out of the quagmire which almost engulfed it in the tenth and the eleventh centuries. At the same time the imperial right to choose Popes, which had so long been exercised and which had been recognised again and again by the Popes themselves, was taken out of the Emperor's hands and entirely controlled by the Roman cardinals.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1892.

2.—Gee, H., and Hardy, W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Lond., 1896.

3.—Neale, J. M., *Mediæval Preachers.* Lond., 1856.

4.—Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book for Mediæval History.* N. Y., 1905.

Bibliographical Note:—The primary material for this subject is practically all in Latin. The most valuable collections are: Migne, *Patrologia,* vols. 119-145; Pertz, *Monumenta;* Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum; Rolls Series;* Muratori; Bouquet.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Baring-Gould, S., *Lives of the Saints.* Lond., 1897–8. 15 vols.
2.—Bowden, J. W., *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.* 2 vols. Lond., 1840. I., 73–283.
3.—Bryce, J., *The Holy Roman Empire.* Various eds. Rev. ed., 1904.
4.—Butler, A., *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints.* Dub., 1866. 12 vols.
5.—Fisher, H., *The Mediæval Empire.*
6.—Greenwood, A., *The Empire and the Papacy in the Middle Ages.*
7.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* Ch. 4.
8.—Greisley, Sir R., *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.* Lond., 1832. Introduction.
9.—Lea, H. C., *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.* Rev. ed.
10.—Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages.* Lond., 1889.
11.—Montalembert, Count de, *The Monks of the West.* Lond., 1896. 7 vols.
12.—Stephens, W. R. W., *Hildebrand and His Times.* N. Y., 1888.
13.—Villemain, A. F., *Life of Gregory VII.* Lond., 1874. 2 vols.
14.—Vincent, M. R., *The Age of Hildebrand.* N. Y., 1896.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, ch. 10. Allen, ii., ch. 3. Alzog, ii., 228–241. Bouzique, ii., bk. 3, ch. 1. Butler, ch. 63–65. Creighton, i., ch. 1, pp. 11–16. Döllinger, iii., ch. 3, sec. 2–3; ch. 5. Emerton, ch. 7. Fisher, pd. 5, ch. 3. Foulkes, ch. 11. Gieseler. Gilmartin, i., ch. 41, 42. Guericke. Hase, sec. 177–180. Hurst, i., 473, 701, 739, 753. Jennings, i., ch. 10; ii., ch. 11. Kurtz, sec. 92, 96, 97, 98. Milman, ii., bk. 5, p. 409. Milner, cent. 9, ch. 3; cent. 11, ch. 2; cent. 12, cent. 13. Moeller. Neander, iii., 346–456. Newman. Riddle, ii., ch. 4, 5. Robertson, bk. 4, ch. 6; bk. 5, ch. 1. Schaff, pd. 4, ch. 4, sec. 63–66. Tout, ch. 5.

CHAPTER XIX

GREGORY VII. AND HIS WORK

OUTLINE: I.—Condition of the Church in 1073. II.—Election of Hildebrand as Pope. III.—Gregory VII.'s matured papal theory and reform ideas. IV.—His efforts to realise his ideals. V.—The investiture strife. VI.—Conclusions. VII.—Sources.

IN 1073 the Church had been raised from the lowest condition to a comparatively high moral plane by the imperial reforms, the labours of earnest German Popes, the Clugniac reformation, and the Hildebrandine Popes. The papal crown was no longer the plaything of a Roman noble, nor the tool of the German Emperor, but had become largely independent of both and a mighty power in Europe. This change was due to the character of the Emperors and Popes, to the religious enthusiasm of the age, to the political confusion in Germany, and to the labours of Hildebrand, particularly in creating the College of Cardinals. A positive reform movement had also been started in the Church, but it remained to be continued and completed. The time, therefore, seemed ripe for the work of a great Pope like Hildebrand.

For twenty-five years Hildebrand had been the power behind the papal throne. He had largely moulded the policy of eight successive Popes, he was the recognised champion of reformation in the Church, he had developed the constitution of the Papacy, he had managed the finances of Rome, he had become

the greatest statesman and the shrewdest churchman in Europe, and he had formed a powerful party to champion his ideas.

Alexander II. breathed his last April 21, 1073. Hildebrand directed that the next three days should be devoted to fasting, charity, and prayer, while the dead Pontiff was being interred, after which the regular election of a Pope would follow. The next day the funeral rites were being celebrated in the old church of St. John Lateran. The ancient structure was crowded to overflowing and Hildebrand, as archdeacon, was conducting the services, when suddenly a cry burst forth from the crowd, "Hildebrand, Hildebrand shall be our Pope. St. Peter chooses our Archdeacon Hildebrand." Rushing to the pulpit, Hildebrand implored silence, but his voice was drowned in the uproar.

Then Cardinal Hugo came forward, and said:

> Well know ye, beloved brethren, that since the days of the blessed Leo, this tried and prudent archdeacon has exalted the Roman See and delivered this city from many perils. Wherefore, since we cannot find any one better qualified for the government of the Church, or the protection of the city, we, the bishops and archbishops, with one voice elect him as pastor and bishop of your souls.

The crowd approved by shouting, "It is the will of St. Peter. Hildebrand is Pope."[1] Then the cardinals led the popular favourite, protesting still and in tears, to the throne of St. Peter, and invested him with the scarlet robe and the tiara as Gregory VII. Like Charles the Great in 800, Gregory VII. pretended to be greatly surprised at this election, which certainly was irregular, if not uncanonical, because the customary three days

[1] Muratori, iii., 304.

had not yet elapsed, the people had nominated and the cardinals had ratified—a complete reversal of the decree of 1059,—and the Emperor had not been consulted at all.

Hildebrand immediately assumed all the duties of his office, but at the same time wrote to Henry IV. stating all the circumstances attending his election and saying that he would refuse consecration until the Emperor should approve of his elevation.[1] The assertions that he asked Henry IV. not to confirm his election and that he threatened to punish the king if made Pope are very improbable.[2] Henry IV. was in a dilemma. He knew that Hildebrand had robbed him of the rights enjoyed by his father and predecessors; consequently the German nobles and simoniacal bishops urged him to annul the election and thus nip the violence of Hildebrand in the bud. He realised the strength of the Hildebrandine party, on the other hand, and feared the results of an open rupture with it in the unsettled condition of Germany. The diplomatic move of Hildebrand, however, seemed to offer a way for surrender under the garb of victory. Therefore Henry sent a trusted representative to Rome to demand an explanation of the illegal election of the Pope. Hildebrand simply stated that the office had been thrust upon him and that he had refused inauguration until the Emperor should consent to his election. Hence the Emperor was forced to confirm the action and forthwith sent his chancellor to witness the installation (June 30th) of Gregory VII.[3]

[1] Greenwood, bk. x., p. 249.

[2] Bonizo, 311.

[3] The assumption of the name Gregory VII. was a blow at imperial power, because Henry III. had deposed Gregory VI., Hildebrand's old master.

The papal philosophy of Gregory VII. was based upon the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. His conception of the Pope is summed up in the famous *Dictatus Papæ* in which he makes the successor of St. Peter God's representative on earth, the absolute sovereign of the Church, and the supreme feudal lord of the world.[1] This ideal he sought to realise in every particular. The clergy, according to his theory, were wholly dependent upon the Pope's will and must be absolutely free from every vice and worldly influence in order that they might labour only to save men's souls. Hence, he believed in the great need of reformation and in the correction of all abuses. The laity, from Emperor to slave, were entirely subjected to the Pope and his clergy in both temporal and spiritual matters, and therefore must render absolute obedience to the commands of the Church. In his reform policy as Pope, Gregory showed himself more hostile than ever against the crying evils of simony and the marriage or concubinage of the clergy. But twenty-five years of effort to cure these evils in the Church had taught him that the real cause of all the other evils was the subjection of the clergy to secular power. The solemn denunciations of simony by the Lateran councils were *nil* as long as kings and nobles offered each ecclesiastical office for sale to the highest bidder. It was useless to order the clergy to give up their luxurious habits and live in ascetic purity as long as they were tools of a licentious aristocracy. Therefore the papal ax must be laid at the very root of the evil,

[1] Emerton, 242; Henderson, 366; Robinson, i., 274; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 69; Ogg, No. 45. It is now pretty clearly established that the *Dictatus* was written about 1087 by Cardinal Deusdedit.

namely, lay investiture and the secular control of the clergy.

In his first efforts to realise his lofty ideal, Gregory VII. desired to unite all Christendom under the suzerainty of the Pope and through this submission to conquer the world for God. On the very day of his consecration (April 30th) he sent Cardinal Hugo to Spain to replace the Gothic with the Roman ritual and thus to secure Spain as a papal fief.[1] A few days later he journeyed in person to southern Italy to secure renewal of the submission of the Normans. When Guiscard refused to comply with his demands, the Pope called on William of Burgundy for troops. Finally he had the Council of Rome excommunicate Guiscard and all his followers and thus forced their fealty.[2] He assumed feudal authority in Bohemia.[3] The Patriarch of Venice was sent to Constantinople to restore the friendly relations between the Greek and Roman churches.[4] He compelled the Italian nobles to swear to him the oath of allegiance.[5] He corrected the church of Carthage,[6] attempted to win over Swen, the King of Denmark, and forbade the King of Norway to interfere in Danish affairs.[7] He treated the King of Hungary as a vassal and rebuked him for recognising the King of Germany as his overlord.[8] Between the Duke of Poland and the King of Russia he

[1] Lib., i., 7, 64; iv., 28; Bowden, i., 334; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 69, 71.

[2] Lib., i., 46, 47; Harduin, vi., 1260, 1521; Johnson, *Normans in Europe*.

[3] Lib., i., 45; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 70.

[4] Lib., i., 18.

[5] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 67, 68.

[6] Lib., i., 22, 23.

[7] Lib., vi., 13.

[8] Lib., i., 13, 63; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 72.

mediated and had the latter go to Rome to be crowned.[1] He forced the French King to promise obedience.[2] He voluntarily sought to act as arbiter between the German King and the Saxons.[3] He demanded Peter's pence from William the Conqueror. The pence was paid, but the oath of loyalty was refused. "I have not nor will I," said William, "swear fealty which was never sworn by any of my predecessors to yours."[4] He wrote an open letter to Christendom advocating a general crusade against the Mohammedans.[5] He asserted his right to end war and to dictate the terms of peace.[6] He declared it to be his duty to compel all rulers to govern their people in righteousness on pain of deposition.[7] In short, no region was too remote or too barbarous not to come within his idea of ecclesiastical unity and of papal suzerainty.[8]

As soon as elected Gregory VII. began to purify the Church by urging the bishops to enforce the laws against simony and celibacy which had been practically dead letters.[9] The King of France was called to account for his simonaical practices and under threat of excommunication forced to promise reformation.[10] Early in 1074 a great reform council was summoned to meet in Rome.[11] Four famous reform decrees were enacted: (1) Churchmen guilty of simony were forbid-

[1] Lib., ii., 73, 74; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 73.
[2] Lib., i., 35; ii., 5, 18, 32; v., 17.
[3] Lib., i., 39.
[4] Lee, 121; Colby, 37; Freeman, *The Norman Conquest.*
[5] Lib., i., 49; ii., 31.
[6] Lib., i., 39; ii., 70; vi., 13, 14.
[7] Lib., ii., 51, 57; iii., 8.
[8] Lib., ii., 51.
[9] Lib., i., 30.
[10] Lib., i., 35, 36, 75.
[11] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 60, 61, 62.

den to officiate in religious services. (2) Buyers of church properties were ordered to restore them and the traffic was prohibited for the future. (3) Priests guilty of marriage or concubinage were debarred from exercising clerical functions. Their blessings would be curses and their prayers sins. This was opposed to "once a priest always a priest." Later Wycliffe, Luther, and other reformers used this same idea with telling effect. (4) Laymen were commanded not to receive ministrations from clergymen guilty of violating these ordinances. Altogether these reform measures were the most radical yet passed. These revolutionary edicts were sent to the archbishops of the various countries with instructions to put them into immediate execution. A special delegation was sent to Henry IV. to inform him of the results of the council. It was headed by the Empress Agnes, Henry's mother, now a nun.[1] A solemn pledge was secured from the German King to execute the reform measures and to dismiss the five councillors, who had been put under the ban by Alexander II.

It will now be necessary to see how these reforms were received in the various countries. Celibacy will be considered first.[2] Historically this institution runs back through the Christian era to the Jewish period. Jewish priests married, but were forbidden to marry harlots, profane women, or widows.[3] The New Testament contains no absolute prohibition of marriage. The Apostles married[4]—even Peter—and the leaders of churches were advised to take unto

[1] Lib., i., 85.
[2] Lea, *History of Celibacy*.
[3] Levit. xxi. 7, 8, 13; Exod. xix., 15.
[4] Mat. viii. 14; 1 Cor. ix., 5.

themselves wives,[1] but many passages were soon interpreted to favour celibacy.[2] The renunciation of all worldly enjoyments and the exaltation of the ascetic life above the social led to voluntary vows of celibacy as early as the second century. It was not long until the Church came to believe that the unmarried condition was the better for the clergy.[3] This belief soon developed a contempt for marriage; and the Popes Calixtus I. (221) and Lucius I. (255) are said to have forbidden the marriage of priests. In 385 the Bishop of Rome enjoined celibacy on all the clergy, and Innocent I., Leo the Great, and succeeding Popes followed the same policy. In the fourth century Church councils took up the question, and the East and the West began to diverge on the subject. All over western Europe councils and synods approved celibacy and sought to force it upon the Church over and over again. Civil law stepped in to confirm these papal and synodical decrees.

In 1073, although celibacy had been the law of the Church for a thousand years, it had never been universally enforced. The Hildebrandine Popes and the Clugniac reformers had made strenuous efforts to execute the reform edicts but had largely failed. In Italy, nearly all the clergy were married in Naples, while Lombardy, Florence, and Ravenna championed the institution; even in Rome itself the clergy were largely married. The sixty wardens in St. Peter's had wives. In Germany a majority of the clergy were opposed to celibacy and, consequently, they were ready to join the Emperor against the Pope. In France the

[1] 1 Cor. ix., 5.
[2] 1 Cor. vii., 38.
[3] Hermas, i., Vis. 2, ch. 3; *Ign. to Polyc.*, ch. 5.

Norman bishops lived openly with their wives and families and the common priests of course followed their leaders. This was the situation which the new Pontiff was called upon to face.

Gregory VII. saw that to realise his theocracy the Church must have an open, democratic, priestly caste. Marriage would make that caste exclusive and hereditary, hence corrupt and worldly, and would thus cripple the Church from priest to Pope.[1] He believed that the enforcement of celibacy would cut the clergy free from the state and wed them to the Church. They would live with the Church as her protectors and not with the world. The Church would be both their bride and their heir. Hence he had the severe measure of 1074 passed and was resolved to enforce it all over Christendom. But the endeavour to execute this radical canon—to destroy an institution which many justified on both moral and natural grounds—to rend asunder ties of the tenderest nature on earth—"to make wives prostitutes and children bastards"—to break up families—was strongly resisted all over Europe.

In Germany the Pope was called a heretic and a madman for setting up such an insane dogma against the teaching of St. Paul. To make men live like angels was childish, it was declared, and would plunge the clergy into worse habits. The churchmen declared that they would be men and give up their priestly offices sooner than desert their families. Several of the bishops headed the anti-celibacy party and openly defied the Pope to enforce his law. The Archbishop of Mainz, as primate, called a council at Erfurt. When he read the decree he was greeted with howls and threats, and nearly lost his life. Other bishops who tried to

[1] Pertz, *Leg.*, ii., 561; Labbe, ix., ann. 937.

promulgate the act were treated in a similar manner. The threats of Gregory availed nothing.[1] The laity, however, probably incited by the Pope, made several outbreaks against the married priests, but without any decisive results, and the evil went on. In France the opposition exceeded that in Germany. A Paris synod repudiated the decree and an abbot who defended the Pope was beaten, spit upon, and dragged to prison.[2] The Archbishop of Rouen attempted to enforce celibacy but was stoned and compelled to flee.[3] The Pope fairly foamed with anger in letters to the French prelates,[4] but the hated edict was not enforced. In England the Pope made no special effort to enforce this reform measure.[5] Lanfranc held a council to reform the Church, but nothing further was done.[6] In Spain the papal legate was menaced and outraged by the clergy, when he tried to enforce celibacy.[7] In Hungary there was shown the same refusal to conform to the new order of things.[8] In Italy, Guiscard, the Norman ruler, led the anti-celibacy party in the south and prevented the execution of the order. In Lombardy, Florence, and Ravenna the hostility was very fierce. Milan defiantly quoted St. Ambrose as authority for a married priesthood.[9] Even in Rome itself the decree was executed only with the greatest difficulty. But in the face of all this opposition Gregory did not waver. Many of the reform party likewise

[1] Lib., ii., 29, 40; iii., 4.
[2] Mansi, xx., 437; Mabillon, vi., 805.
[3] Mansi, xx., 441.
[4] Lib., ii., Ep. 5, 18, 32.
[5] Lib., i., 70, 71.
[6] Harduin, vi., 1555.
[7] *Ibid.*, vi., 1605.
[8] Mansi, xx., 758, 760.
[9] Greenwood, iv., 434.

laboured incessantly with him to cure the evil. Ultimately, but not in his life time, the principle he fought for was to dominate.

Simony, one of the most wide-spread evils of the Middle Ages, originated with Simon Magnus who wished to buy the power of the Holy Spirit with money.[1] The term was gradually extended in its meaning from the buying or selling of the power of ordination to the purchase or sale of any ecclesiastical office or privilege. As early as the third century a rich matron bought the bishopric of Carthage for her servant.[2] This evil practice slowly grew in the Church, until Charles the Great made Church offices objects of eager desire to the worldly, then the crime spread to a fearful extent. The feudalisation of the Church made the evil very common from the Pope to priest and even gave it the appearance of legality.[3] Conrad II. openly offered bishoprics and abbeys for sale to the highest bidders.[4] In the time of Hildebrand the papal office itself was openly bought and sold. His own teacher, Gregory VI., had purchased the empty honour for one thousand pounds of silver. Archbishops purchased their sinecures and in turn compensated themselves by selling minor benefices to their subordinates. Bishoprics and abbacies were commonly sold to the highest bidders by the kings and nobles. The most ordinary ecclesiastical positions and even consecrations to the priesthood were sold. So widespread indeed was the practice that it was generally viewed as normal and legitimate.[5]

[1] Acts iii., 18.
[2] Gibbon, ii., 457.
[3] Bowen, i., 289.
[4] Greenwood, iv., 277.
[5] Bowen, i., 289.

Opposition to the evil early appeared and, from the fourth century, councils and synods denounced it. In 829 the Council of Paris asked the King to destroy this heresy so detestable, this pest so hateful to God."[1] All of the good Popes from Gregory I. to Gregory VII. attacked the abuse. Even the Emperor Henry III. attempted to root it out.[2] The *corpus juris canonicis* supplemented by the civil law made it a crime and designated the penalties. Priests were to be deprived of their benefices and deposed from orders; monks were to be confined in stricter monasteries; and laymen were to be subjected to penance. Every reformer and reform movement began by making an attack on simony. But simony was too deeply rooted as a part of the social, political, and religious world to be materially affected before the time of Gregory VII., who knew that it would be impossible to realise his earthly theocracy so long as this sin demoralised and secularised the clergy, and subjected them to worldly control. The edict of 1074, therefore, threw down the gauntlet and declared war.[3] This had often been done before, but Gregory now attacked the chief sinners in selling Church offices, namely, the King of France, who gave excuses and promised amendment,[4] and the King of Germany, who confessed his sin and declared his intention to repair the evil.[5] But this edict like that prohibiting celibacy was not enforced simply because the secular rulers and the clergy alike were infected with the disease. The Pope resolved, therefore, to

[1] Harduin, iv., 1302.

[2] *Cf.* Fisher.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 60, 61; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 275; Henderson, 365.

[4] Lib., i., Ep. 9, 11, 35, 75.

[5] Lib., i., 29, 30.

wage the war in person and to strike at the very source of all simony. For success he relied upon the thunderbolts of his office.

The investiture strife next engaged the attention of Gregory VII. and tested his power and ability to the utmost. Lay investiture, like so many other practices in the Church, had its origin back in the formative period of the ecclesiastical organisation. Under the Roman Empire the Emperor exercised much power in the appointment of Popes and bishops.[1] The Merovingians and the Carolingians, following the earlier precedents, both exercised the right of nominating bishops in the Frankish kingdom.[2] Under Charles the Great and his descendants, prelates became identified with barons—the hierarchical governors of the Church with the feudal dignitaries of the Empire,—hence arose the universal custom of ratifying the episcopal elections by regal investiture. The bishop, or abbot, when elected, gave pledges of fidelity and devotion and later paid the feudal fee. The king then invested him with the emblems of the office, namely, the sacerdotal ring signifying his marriage to the Church, and the pastoral staff indicating his protection of his flock. Then he was consecrated by the metropolitan. When the bishop died, the ring and staff were returned to the king, or to the local secular authority. In Germany the bishoprics and abbacies almost ceased being ecclesiastical and became little more than political divisions of the kingdom. They bore the same relation to the sovereign as did the secular feudal fiefs. The holders had the rights of coinage, toll, market, and jurisdiction; they attended court and exercised military

[1] See Chapter XIV.
[2] Greenwood, i., 484, 485.

powers like nobles. By the time of Hildebrand the vast ecclesiastical states all over Europe were feudalised and kings and nobles controlled the appointment of all bishops and abbots. The higher clergy were recruited mostly from the worldly nobility, who united their religious with their civil duties. This lay investiture was the cause of the wide-spread, brutalising sin of simony and must be annihilated if the Church was to be purified and to fulfil her high mission on earth.[1] The French king and the favourites of Henry IV. had filled their pockets through the most notorious simoniacal dealings.[2]

Before the time of Hildebrand, simony, but not lay investiture, had been attacked. In 1063 a Roman synod forbade the clergy receiving churches from the laymen. Milan and the German court in 1068 came into collision about the appointment of a bishop. Hildebrand, immediately upon his election, found occasion to praise Anself for refusing installation from Henry IV. In 1075 he called a council at Rome and had this famous revolutionary decree passed:

If any one shall from henceforth receive any bishopric or abbey from any layman, let him not be received among the bishops or abbots, nor let the privilege of audience be granted him as to a bishop or abbot. We, moreover, deny to such person the favour of St. Peter and an entrance into the Church, until he shall have resigned the dignity which he has obtained both by the crime of ambition and disobedience which is idolatry. And similarly do we decree concerning the lesser dignities of the Church. Also if any Emperor, Duke, Marquis, Count, secular person or power, shall presume to give investiture of any bishopric

[1] Lib., i., Ep. 92, 119; ii., 12, 18.
[2] Greenwood, iv., 281.

or ecclesiastical dignity let him know himself to be bound by the same sentence.[1]

This edict was immediately sent to all the bishops of the Empire and no doubt all over Christendom. It began the struggle which rent both the Empire and the Church into two hostile parties and continued long after Gregory VII. died in exile. It was unquestionably revolutionary, because Pope after Pope had recognised the right of investiture by laymen and the matter was generally treated as authorised by public law.[2]

The Pope opened the skirmish through the council by citing many bishops from Germany, England, France, and Italy to answer to him for ecclesiastical offences, chiefly simoniacal; by continuing the curse laid on Robert of Apulia; by threatening the King of France with interdict, unless he repented and made reparation; by deposing the bishops of Pavia, Turin, and Piacenza; by treating the German prelates with unusual severity; in repeating the excommunication of the German King's ministers; and in putting under the ban the bishops of Speyer and Strassburg and the Archbishop of Bremen.

The conflict centred about Henry IV., who entirely disregarded the law of lay investiture.[3] He looked upon investiture as a royal prerogative, hence he invested the Bishop of Liege (July, 1075), appointed his chaplain Archbishop of Milan against the Pope's nominee (Sept., 1075), named a Bishop of Bomberg without consulting Gregory VII.,[4] chose the Abbot of Fulda (Dec.,

[1] Harduin, vi., 1551; Pertz, viii., 412; Lib., iii., 367; Henderson, 365.

[2] Greenwood, iv., 244, 245.

[3] Henry's humble letter of 1073 should be borne in mind. Bowen, i., 340.

[4] Pertz, v., 219.

1075) and also for Lorsch,[1] disposed of the churches of Fermo and Spolita in the same way, and reached the climax when he attempted to force his own candidate into the archiepiscopal seat of Cologne.[2] Gregory viewed these acts as an infraction of the King's promises and as showing contempt for the law of the Holy See and its prerogatives. Hence he summoned the Archbishop of Milan to Rome to answer for his intrusion.[3] After the next appointments were made by the King (Dec., 1075), he wrote a stern letter of admonition to the king.[4] Finally, after the Cologne affair, the Pope cited the king to answer for his sins at Rome before a certain date or "Be cut off from the body of the Lord and be smitten with the curse of the anathema." The legates who carried this information to the king were insultingly dismissed.[5]

Henry IV., backed up by the German clergy and nobility and joined by the anti-sacerdotal and anti-reform parties in Italy, felt powerful enough to defy the command of the Pope.[6] To offset the summons to Rome Henry called the Diet of Worms (Jan. 25, 1076), at which twenty-four bishops and two archbishops were present. Cardinal Hugo, who had helped to make Hildebrand Pope but who was now under the ecclesiastical ban, brought forged complaints from Italy and read a false life of Gregory VII. The Emperor and

[1] Pertz, v., 236, 237.

[2] *Ibid.*, v., 241.

[3] Lib., iii., Ep. 8; Greenwood, iv., 362.

[4] Lib., iii., Ep. 10; Greenwood, iv., 365; Bowen, ii., 75; Ogg, No. 46; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 74; Henderson, 373.

[5] Greenwood, iv., 365 to 369; Pertz, v., 241; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 276; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 74; Henderson, 367.

[6] Greenwood, iv., 371; Bowen, ii., 81; Henderson, 372; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 279; Ogg, No. 47.

the bishops renounced their allegiance to the Pope and formally impeached him on seven grave charges ranging from the grossest licentiousness to the assumption of the functions of God Himself.[1] The king immediately sent letters announcing this action to the prelates and cities of Lombardy, where the news was received with joy; to the Romans calling upon them to expel "The enemy of the Empire," "The false Monk Hildebrand," the "Usurper of the Holy See"; and to the Pope himself to whom the letter was delivered in the very Lateran Council to which the king had been summoned.

The royal herald addressed the Pope in these words: "My lord, the King, and the bishops of the Empire, do by mouth command you, Hildebrand, without delay to resign the Chair of Peter, for it is unlawful for you to aspire to so lofty a place without the royal consent and investiture." Incensed by this insolent address, the lay attendants of the Pope would have drawn their swords upon the herald had the Pope not covered him with his mantle.[2] When the tumult had subsided Gregory spoke to the council in these words:

Let us not, brethren, disturb the Church of God by noise and tumult. Doth not the holy scripture teach us to expect perilous times—seasons in which men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to fathers, unthankful, unholy, not rendering obedience to their teachers? . . . The word of God calleth to us, "It must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh." And unto us it is said, in order to instruct us how we ought to demean ourselves in the sight of our enemies: "Behold,

[1] Pertz, ii., 44; Mansi, xx., 466; Greenwood, v., 379; Henderson, 373; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 76.

[2] Muratori, iii., 334.

I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." And what though at this very time the forerunner of anti-Christ hath risen up in the Church, yet we, under the instructions of the Lord and of the holy fathers, have long since learned how duly to combine both these virtues.[1]

The council now amidst the greatest indignation urged the Pope to depose the insolent king and to put him and his accomplices under the ban. The king was formally excommunicated and his subjects absolved from all allegiance to him.[2] The churchmen who acted as the king's tools were likewise outlawed and a letter to "all defenders of the Christian faith" announced the curse laid on Germany.[3] This was the first instance of the deposition of a king by a Pope and was based on the false decretals and the assumption that this power was an undoubted prerogative of the Chair of St. Peter.[4] As a result of this action both Germany and Italy were divided into two great parties, the papal and the imperial. Hoping to save himself by a counter blow,[5] Henry had one of his bishops pronounce an excommunication and anathema upon Gregory and induced a servile synod at Pavia to reiterate the curse. Civil and ecclesiastical discord broke out throughout the Empire. Disaffected nobles took this occasion to conspire against the king, and to plot with the papal party. Prelates fell over each other in their eagerness

[1] Bowen, ii., 101; Greenwood, iv., 385.

[2] Bowen, ii., 108; Greenwood, iv., 386; Harduin, vi., 1566; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 77; Henderson, 376; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 281; Ogg, No. 48.

[3] Henderson, 380; Bowen, ii., 110; Greenwood, iv., 388; Lib., iii., Ep. 6.

[4] Greenwood, iv., 389.

[5] Henderson, 377.

to desert the outlawed ruler and to seek reconciliation with the Pope. The German papal party held a great convention (Oct. 14, 1076) at Tribur on the Rhine. The king was in camp just across the river at Oppenheim with his army. The Pope sent his representatives to purify the convention and to guide the proceedings. All the sins of the age were charged against the king and all allegiance to him was renounced, while it was declared that the crown would be forfeited within a year unless the king obtained absolution. He was ordered to retire to Speyer as a private gentleman until the question was settled and the Pope was urged to hasten to Germany to pass sentence on the royal head.

Henry saw that the tide was against him and resolved to follow the one course open to him, namely, to throw himself at the feet of the Pope and beg forgiveness. He dismissed his court and his ministers, publicly repudiated every act against the Holy See, promised satisfaction to the Pope and reformation,[1] begged a permit to visit Rome to sue for pardon, and started for Italy in 1077 to meet the Pope. His accomplices, probably at his suggestion, took the same course but by another route. Meanwhile the Pope was hastening northward to Germany. With excellent tact and courage Henry made his way over the Alps in the midst of a very severe winter into northern Italy, where he was given a hearty welcome, and then hastened on to Canossa, a strong castle belonging to the Countess Matilda where the Pope had broken his journey. Meanwhile the companions and ministers of Henry who had fallen under the papal displeasure outstripped the king and, with naked feet and clothed in sackcloth, presented themselves to the

[1] Henderson, 384; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 78.

Pope, humbly imploring pardon and absolution from the terrible anathema. With some hesitation, the Pope granted their petition. After a brief penance, the penitents were dismissed with an injunction not to hold any communication with the king, until he should in like manner have been released from the bonds of the Church.

With his natural impetuosity Henry resolved to have the humiliating scene over with as soon as possible. To plead his case he had secured the good offices of his mother-in-law, several powerful noblemen, the Abbot of Clugny, and a few other influential orthodox members of the papal party. He had even pursuaded the Countess Matilda to induce the Pope to give his case a merciful consideration. The Pope's severity was softened by the entreaties coming from so many persons, and it was finally agreed that the king should appear before the Pope on a certain day; that he should fully admit his guilt; that he should express sincere repentance for the insults he had heaped upon this successor of St. Peter; that he should profess full contrition for all his sins and crimes; and that he should promise to atone for all former vices by obeying papal commands in the future and by submitting to such conditions as the Pope should impose. Henry accepted these terms and prepared for the act of shame and humiliation.

On the stated day he appeared before the outer gate of the castle of Canossa, was admitted into the outer court and told to divest himself of every vestige of royalty. He was then dressed in a garment of sackcloth and stood in the outer court barefooted and fasting from morn till night.

And thus [says the biographer of Hildebrand] for three

entire days, he ceased not, with much weeping and many supplications, to implore the apostolic commiseration, until the bowels of all the spectators yearned with compassion, so that with tears in their eyes they earnestly besought the pontiff to have mercy—nay, even so that they exclaimed against the stern severity of the man of God as smacking of cruelty: then at length, overborne by the solicitations of all around him, he resolved to admit the penitent into the bosom of the Church; but only upon terms which should either crush him effectually, or for the remainder of his days convert him into the passive instrument of the papal policy.[1]

The stipulations of absolution accepted by Henry were: (1) That he should appear for trial before an imperial synod to answer all charges, and that if proven innocent should retain his crown; but if by the laws of the Church he should be proved guilty he would surrender all claims to the throne. (2) That until the trial, he should lay aside royalty and perform no active government. (3) That until acquitted he should collect no more taxes than was absolutely necessary for the sustenance of his family. (4) That all contracts with his subjects should be invalid until after the trial. (5) That he should dismiss from his service all councillors designated by the Pope. (6) That if freed of guilt, he should promise obedience and aid in reforming the Church. (7) That the violation of any of these terms would *ipso facto* invalidate the absolution.[2] Then followed the solemn act of absolution and the sacerdotal purgation which was taken by the Pope but declined by the king. The

[1] Henderson, 385; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 282; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 80.

[2] Henderson, 385; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 81; Ogg, No. 49.

king was then admitted to communion and sumptuously feasted by the Pope, after which he was dismissed to rejoin his followers awaiting him at the castle gate. The trying ordeal of Canossa was over. The mighty Pope of small, wiry stature and physically weak had compelled, by the sheer force of the spiritual weapons in his hands, the powerful German ruler to humbly bow before him and beg forgiveness and absolution. Apparently it was a great victory for the Pope, but the sequel makes the result look like a defeat.[1]

Henry's humiliation alienated his Lombard adherents. By opposing Rome he had lost one kingdom; by submitting to Rome he was about to lose another. No sooner was he beyond the castle walls of Canossa with the heavy curse removed from his head than he began to plot to remove the effects of his apparently disgraceful defeat. From now on the king becomes the aggressive champion of secular supremacy, while the Pope assumes the defensive. A trap was laid to catch the Pope at the Council of Mantua and he was practically held as a prisoner at Canossa. Meanwhile Henry openly violated his agreement, by assuming the rule of Lombardy, and denounced the Pope in strong terms. The rebellious princes in Germany, urged on by the papal party and taking advantage of this situation, called the convention of Forscheim, and there elected Rudolph of Swabia as King of Germany. He promised to abolish simony, to renounce the right of investing bishops, and to recognise the law of heredity, so was crowned March 26, 1077. Under these circumstances Henry IV., supported by the Lombard party and the strong imperial party in Germany, returned to his kingdom to regain his crown through civil war.

[1] Pertz, v.; Bowen, ii., 161; Greenwood, iv., 411.

Gregory VII., hoping to profit by the situation, demanded that both kings refer their cause to him as arbiter and, finally, when Henry proved obstinate, in a council held at Rome in 1080 the Pope renewed the excommunication of Henry, and again deposed him.[1] The German crown was bestowed by apostolic authority upon Rudolph. In the same council the edict against lay investiture was renewed in a harsher spirit than ever. War to the knife was now inevitable. Rigid party lines were again formed. Henry gradually recovered his mastery of Germany. The German clergy in June, 1080, blaming Gregory VII. for the ruinous civil war, once more retaliated by deposing the Pope.[2] A council held at Brescia the same year elected Clement III. as anti-Pope. Gregory's efforts to raise up allies were all in vain. Henry IV. laid seige to Rome with a big army and at last after a long struggle was master of it. Clement III. was installed as Pope and on Easter Day, 1084, Henry IV. received as his reward the imperial crown. Gregory VII., defeated by the German warrior and rescued from the Eternal City with difficulty by the trusty Normans, withdrew to Salerno to die with the curse of the Emperor on his lips, saying: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile" (May 25, 1085).

Gregory VII. was a man of unquestionable ascetic purity. The charges made against him by his enemies are probably untrue. His relations with Matilda, Beatrice, and Empress Agnes were of the purest character. In his efforts and ideas he was undoubtedly sincere and firmly believed that he really was the representative of God on earth. It must be remem-

[1] Greenwood, iv., 507; Henderson, 388.

[2] Henderson, 391, 394.

bered, however, that his conceptions of veracity, justice, honour, and charity were those of a mediæval despot. He was one of the greatest politicians of the Middle Ages, but a policy man controlled by the loftiest purpose. To attain his ecclesiastical ideal, policy and principle were one and he almost acted as though the end justified the means. After Charles the Great and Otto the Great before him and Innocent III. after him he had the greatest organising mind of the Middle Ages. Few other men can compare with him. He comprehended the grand *Civitas Dei* of Augustine and through the false decretals he attempted to create the great universal papal theocracy in which the state should be subject to the Church, the Church purified and subjected to the Pope, and the whole Church ruled by *Lex Christi*. Nature endowed him with an indomitable will, a restless energy, a clear perception, a dauntless courage, an imperious temper, an instinct for leadership, a stern inflexible disposition, a haughty insolent bearing, and a power to draw and to repulse. These native talents were intensified by monastic education which taught him both the virtue and necessity of obedience, trained him to subordinate all affections, opinions, and interest to the one great object, and made him a true child of the mediæval Church with the highest ideas of her prerogatives and mission on earth. The churchman completely swallowed up the man.

Hildebrand was a wily religious autocrat and not a theologian or a moralist. His ideas came from Augustine and Pseudo-Isidore. His Christianity was based on tradition and historical evolution rather than on the Bible. He denounced simony and advocated celibacy, but not on moral grounds so much as because of his sincere conviction about their effect on his

great ecclesiastical machine. The Church to him was a grand secular power, resting on spiritual foundations, which had to employ worldly means against the other secular powers. Europe was a chessboard and with the hand of a skilled master he moved kings, queens, knights, and bishops. His schemes were worthy of the plotter—his courage became defiance in danger—his forces were handled with consummate skill—his fatal thrusts were driven home with his teeth clenched—if he seemed to yield it was only to gain a greater advantage. As Pope he was over all, the source of all law, judged by none, and responsible to God alone. Under this conviction, intensified as the years passed, he lived in perpetual conflict, and died a refugee from the capital of his great ecclesiastical Empire.

Napoleon once said: "Si je n'etais Napoleon, je voudrais être Gregoire VII." There were many points of resemblance between these two great characters. Both were of obscure birth and low origin. Both possessed the same indomitable character and threatening ambition. Both were reformers. Gregory established a hierarchy which still lives; Napoleon created an administration which still survives. Gregory wanted to make the Church the master of the world; Napoleon, France. Gregory made the *Lex Christi* the basis of all; Napoleon, the revolution. Both wanted to make feudal vassals of the world's rulers. Both had an indomitable enemy—Henry IV. and England. Both used the power of excommunication. Gregory had his Canossa; Napoleon his Moscow. Italy was invaded and Rome sacked; France was invaded and Paris taken. Salerno and St. Helena in each case closed the drama.

Gregory VII. was the creator of the political Papacy of the Middle Ages because he was the first who dared to completely enforce the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. He found the Pope elected by the Emperor, the Roman clergy, and the people; he left the election in the hands of an ecclesiastical College of Cardinals. He found the Papacy dependent upon the Empire; he made it independent of the Empire and above it. He declared the states of Europe to be fiefs of St. Peter and demanded the oath of fealty from their rulers. He found the clergy, high and low, dependent allies of secular princes and kings; he emancipated them and subjected them to his own will. He reorganised the Church from top to bottom by remodelling the papal curia, by establishing the College of Cardinals, by employing papal legates, by thwarting national churches, by controlling synods and councils, and by managing all Church property directly. He was the first to enforce the theory that the Pope could depose and confirm or reject kings and Emperors. He attempted to reform the abuses in the Church and to purify the clergy. Only partial success attended these efforts, but triumph was to come later on as a result of his labours. His endeavour to realise his theocracy was grand but impracticable as proved by its failure. It was like forcing a dream to be true; yet Innocent III. almost succeeded in western Europe a little more than a century later. The impress of Gregory VII.'s gigantic ability was left upon his own age and upon all succeeding ages.

The strife over lay investiture was carried on by the successors of Gregory VII. Victor III. (1086–1087) renewed the investiture decrees but died too soon to accomplish anything. Urban II. (1088–1099), imbued

with the zeal and ability of Hildebrand, drove Henry IV. out of Italy and had his son, Conrad, crowned King of Italy (1093). Pope Urban gave all his strength to the crusading mania and made little progress with the Hildebrandine reform. Paschal II. (1099–1118), a Clugniac monk and cardinal under Gregory VII., renewed the excommunication of Henry IV., and plotted with Henry V. to induce him to revolt against his father (1104) and thus to force him to surrender his crown. The aged Henry IV. died under the awful curse of the Church and at war with this traitorous son. Paschal II. took up the question of lay investiture, likewise, and had the practice condemned in the Council of Troyes (1107) and promulgated the prohibition all over Christendom. Henry V. was forced to abjure investiture before he could again receive his imperial crown from papal hands. At length in 1111 Paschal II. entered into an arrangement with Henry V., who had appeared before Rome with a large army, by which the Pope promised that clerical princes in the Empire should give up all temporal rights and possessions received since the time of Charles the Great. The Church and its clergy were to live on the tithes and the gifts of pious persons. The Emperor, for his part, agreed to surrender all claim to nomination, election, and investiture, and to guarantee to the Papacy the full enjoyment of all its possessions and rights. This agreement was fair and just, though the German clergy objected to such a wholesale change without their consent. The compact was publicly proclaimed in St. Peter's before the imperial coronation of Henry V. (Feb. 12, 1111)[1] and aroused a great tumult.

[1] Henderson, *Hist. Docs. of the M. A.*, 405; Matthews, p. 61; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 83, 84.

Therefore Henry V. repudiated the treaty, captured the Pope, carried him together with the cardinals off as prisoners, and wrung from him ignoble terms of peace (Apr. 12th) which stated that the clerical princes in Germany were to retain all their possessions, that the Emperor was to have the full right of investiture, but without simony, and that the higher clergy were to consecrate the nominees after their investiture.[1] At the same time Paschal crowned Henry and promised never to excommunicate him. After the Pope's release, he had a Roman synod repudiate the treaty and of course the excommunication of the Emperor followed (1112) and civil war was continued.

Calixtus II. (1119–1124), a Clugniac monk of the royal Burgundian house, settled the perplexing question of lay investiture in 1122 by the Concordat of Worms.[2] The Pope agreed (1) that the election of bishops and abbots in Germany should occur in the Emperor's presence and without simony or violence; (2) that the Emperor should decide all disputed elections and enforce his decisions; (3) that the Emperor should invest with the lance and receive homage; (4) that bishops or abbots consecrated in Italy or Burgundy should also be invested by the Emperor and render homage within six months; (5) and that papal aid should be given to the Emperor whenever requested. The Emperor for his part promised (1) to surrender all investiture through the ring and the staff to the Church; (2) to grant "canonical elections and free consecration" in all churches in the Empire; (3) to restore "all the possessions and regalia of St. Peter" to the Holy

[1] In 1115 the famous donation of Matilda was made.

[2] Henderson, *Hist. Docs. of the M. A.*, 408; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 85, 86; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 292; Ogg, No. 50.

Roman Church; (4) to secure the return of property held by others; (5) and to give the Pope all needed aid and justice.[1] The concordat was in character, therefore, a compromise. It spared both the Emperor and the Pope the humiliation of defeat because now both made the appointment—one politically, the other spiritually. The Emperor retained but half of his former rights, yet could control the elections. The Pope gained "the ring and staff," yet fell far short of what Gregory VII. had demanded. The document was full of ambiguity and who was victor—Pope or Emperor—has been a much disputed question. The concordat lasted down through the centuries as the basis for settling all these appointments until the dissolution of the Empire in 1806. It was frequently violated by both Emperor and Pope, but on the whole gave general satisfaction and determined many menacing disputes. It was modified by Lothair in 1183 so as to permit the Emperor to send a delegate to the election.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Colby, C. W., *Selections from the Sources of English History.* N. Y., 1899, No. 14, 16.

2.—Finch, G., *A Selection of the Letters of Hildebrand.* Lond., 1853. 40 important letters.

3.—Gee, H., and Hardy, W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Lond., 1896.

4.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1892.

5.—Lee, G. C., *Leading Documents of English History.* Lond., 1900. Sec. 50, 51, 52, 57.

[1] At the great Lateran council of 1123 this Concordat of Worms was confirmed.

6.—Ogg, F. A., *Source-Book of Mediæval History.* N. Y., 1908.
7.—Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History.* I., 266–290.
8.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History,* 132–160.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Bowden, J. W., *Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.* Lond., 1840. 2 vols.
2.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri.* IV., 139–609. Lond., 1861.
3.—Greisley, Sir R., *The Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII.* Lond., 1832.
4.—Gurney J. H., *Four Ecclesiastical Biographies.* Lond., 1864.
5.—Lea, H. C., *Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.* New ed.
6.—McMichael, N., *Hildebrand and His Age.* Edinb., 1853.
7.—Schefer, G. L. I., *Historical Notice of the Life and Times of Pope Gregory VII.* Lond., 1851.
8.—Stephen, Sir J., *Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography.* Lond., 1867.
9.—Stephens, W. R. W., *Hildebrand and His Times.* N. Y., 1898.
10.—Villemain, A. F., *Life of Gregory VII.* Lond., 1874. 3 vols.
11.—Vincent, M. R., *The Age of Hildebrand.* N. Y., 1897.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, *Civ. dur. M. A.*, 240 *ff.*, 267, 393, 414. *Med. Civ.*, 82 *ff.* Allen, ii., ch. 3. Alzog, ii., 253–336, 342–367, 481–510. Bryce, ch. x. Butler, ch. 70–72. Creighton, i., 16. Crooks, ch. 33. Darras, iii., 107 *ff.* Döllinger, iii., pd. 4, ch. 2, sec. 1. Emerton, ch. 8. Fisher, pd. 6, ch. 1. Fitzgerald, ii., 54–67. Foulkes, ch. 2. Gibbon, v., 61, 477; vi., 426. Gieseler, ii., sec. 23; iii. Gilmartin, ii., ch. 1–3. Gregorovius, bk. vii., ch. 5, 6. Hallam, ii., ch. 5. Hardwick, ch. 6, sec. 1; ch. 10, sec. 1. Hase, sec. 181. Hurst, i., ch. 37. Jennings, ii., ch. 11. Knight, ch. 12.

Kurtz, sec. 94, 96, 101. Milman, iii., 140 *ff.* Moeller, ii., 255–265. Mosheim, cent. 9, pt. 2, ch. 2. Neander, iv., 82, 86, 123, 131, 134, 146, 194, 206, 233. Platina, *Lives of Popes*, ii., 1–12. Ranke, *Hist. of Pap.*, i., 29 *ff.* Riddle, ii., ch. 4, 5. Robertson, bk. 5, ch. 1, 2. Robinson, ch. 13. Tout, *Emp. and Pap.*, ch. 5, 6. Wilkes, *Hist. of Popes.* Workman, ch. 4.

CHAPTER XX

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CRUSADES

OUTLINE: I.—The rise and spread of Mohammedanism. II.—Positive and negative causes of the Crusades. III.—Character and description of the Crusades. IV.—Results and influences of the Crusades. V.—Sources.

MOHAMMEDANISM,[1] like Judaism and Christianity, had its origin in the Semitic race. Its birthplace was in Arabia, a desert region. The time of its appearance was the seventh century, and its founder was Mohammed.

The condition of Arabia at Mohammed's birth (*c.* 570) must be understood in order to have an intelligent comprehension of this new religion. Politically the Arabs were united in a very loose sort of confederacy. The real government was in the hands of tribal chiefs. Although a prey to Greek and Persian influences, yet the hardy Arabians had never been conquered. They were divided into wandering tribes with practices and customs characteristic of tribal relations. Few cities were found among them and many of the conveniences of civilisation known to peoples of fixed habitations were lacking. Through trading, begging, and robbing these Arabs had de-

[1] Gilman, *The Saracens;* Ameer Ali, *Life and Teachings of Mohammed* and *A Short History of the Saracens;* Muir, *Life of Mohammed* and *Annals of the Early Caliphate;* Lane-Poole, *Speeches and Table Talk of the Prophet Mohammed;* Gibbon, v., ch. 50, 51; various eds. of the Koran.

veloped a cosmopolitan spirit and liberality. They monopolised the overland trading routes; carried on an extensive industry in raising sheep, horses, and camels; cultivated fruit-growing to some extent; and were very fond of holding great fairs at which their possessions were exhibited and bartering carried on. Educationally the Arabs were a very superior people. Arabia was the home of the alphabet and of numbers, and had developed a perfect language. The people had an intense love for poetry and the eloquence of their leaders was of high order. From the Greeks they had received a knowledge of the natural and abstract sciences. Of all the peoples therefore in western Asia the Arabs were perhaps the most highly civilised and the most progressive.

Complete religious liberty and toleration were permitted among the Arabs, hence Jews, Christians, Fire-worshippers, and Star-worshippers were found among them. The Jews were very numerous especially in Medina. The Christians found in Arabia were either the descendants of those heretical sects driven from the Roman Empire in the fierce controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries,[1] or monks and hermits who were still found there in large numbers.[2] But Christianity made little impression upon the Arabs. It appears in fact never to have fully satisfied any of the Eastern peoples—at least no branch of the Semitic race has ever taken kindly to it.

The Arabic religion was something of a mixture between monotheism and idolatrous polytheism. Every

[1] Among these sects were Arians, Sabellians, Ebionites, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monophysites, Marianites, and Collyridians.

[2] The Bible had probably been translated into Arabic before the Koran appeared. Gibbon, ch. 50.

house had its own idol and every tribe had its special deity, but above all these particular gods stood the universal god, Allah, by whom the holiest oaths were sworn, in whose name treaties were made, and yet who was worshipped least and last. Mecca was the religious capital, having been selected by Hagar and Ishmael, and was the home of the Kaaba, built by Abraham and his son Ishmael, containing the famous Black Stone.[1] A well organised priesthood, monopolised by the Koraish tribe, conducted worship and performed the sacred rites, which were accompanied by a rather elaborate ceremony. Great religious feasts were numerous, particularly in the "holy months." By the seventh century the Arabic religion was in a very low condition. It resembled the decrepid and effete Roman and Greek religions in the later days of their existence. There arose everywhere, consequently, a cry for reformation, or for a substitution, and this demand soon crystallised into a reform party, which rejected polytheism and preached aceticism while holding fast to a belief in Allah. It is quite possible that the members of this party received both their inspiration and their ideas from the Christian hermits. They were called the Hanifs or Puritans. This wide-spread desire for reformation indicates that Arabia was ripe for a religious revolution and that the times were ready for the great work of Mohammed.

In the holy city of Mecca in 570 Mohammed was born. He was connected by blood with the Koraish tribe and from this source may have inherited certain pronounced religious tendencies. Orphaned at six and reared by an uncle, who was a trader, he made extensive travels of a business character throughout

[1] Muir, ii., 18, 35; Burckhardt, *Travels*, 136.

western Asia. In this way he gained a cosmopolitan education, had a wider outlook on the world than was customary, and may have come into close touch with Judaism and Christianity. At the age of twenty-five he entered the service of a rich widow, Chadijah, and later married her though she was fifteen years his senior. Her wealth brought him into prominence and gave him a commanding social and industrial position. In his own behalf, now, he made several extensive commercial trips. One of Chadijah's cousins was a Hanif and, like the Hanifs and hermits in general, he was a zealous missionary. Mohammed soon fell under the influence of him and other Puritans and soon joined these ascetic reformers. He often retired to the mountains for prayer and ascetic practices and the religious fermentation in his soul in a short time produced an explosion. He early became subject to fits, —whether epileptic, cataleptic, or hysterical is unknown,—and in these swoons professed to have had religious visions. In one of these the angel Gabriel appeared to him and communicated the new faith, the sum of which was: "There is but one God and Mohammed is his prophet."

Thus fired with a mighty mission, he began to denounce the old religion and to propagate the new (610). His first convert was his faithful wife; then his bosom friend, Abubekr, received the faith and next his adopted son, Ali. With this trio of stanch believers back of him, he continued his public preaching of the message which had come to him in Mecca, the very heart of Arabian idolatry. When his uncle and benefactor, Abu Taleb, tried to persuade him to desist the brave fanatic answered: "Spare your remonstrances; if they should place the sun on my right

hand and the moon on my left they should not divert me from my course." His converts increased among his own family and friends and also among the poor of Mecca. His activity and radical statements aroused the enmity of the Koraish priests who sought to either expel him or to slay him. They soon forced him to depart from Mecca and to carry on his propagandism among the neighbouring villages. At length, realising that a price was set on his head, he escaped in 622 to Medina. This is called the Hegira, or Flight, and marks the beginning of the Mohammedan chronology.

Medina at this time was in need of a strong ruler, so Mohammed was given an enthusiastic reception and was soon recognised as the head of both church and state. With this new power came a change in the method of propagating the new religion, namely, from persuasion to the sword. Just what the reasons for this change were it is not easy to say; perhaps the leading motive was that of revenge. At first he began to lead marauding expeditions against the merchant caravans of Mecca. Soon he became the prophet warrior of the Arabs and professed to have orders from Allah to make war upon all idolators.[1] With this taste of blood and power Mohammed's character and religion both were changed. His military enterprises were almost invariably successful. By 630 he had captured Mecca and through the great battle of Taif he made himself master of all Arabia. He consolidated his religion and instituted laws to govern his people, and finally died at Mecca in 632.

Mohammed was one of the unique characters of earth. Agreeable, true to his friends, very simple in his domestic relations, he was deeply religious and certainly

[1] Koran, *Sura* ii., 189, 214; xvii., 4–7.

at first a sincere reformer. His soul was full of poetry and his intellect at times was frenzied and insane. When he changed his method of spreading the new faith after the Hegira, it was not due to hypocrisy, nor to the charge made that he became an impostor, but can be explained as the outcome of a new situation and new influences which changed both his views and his methods. Certain it is that neither he nor any of his devoted followers for a moment questioned the reality of the revelation which came to him, nor of the leadership to which he was called. Although influenced by many of the evils of his age such as deceit, revenge, and sensuality, still he must be viewed as an honest revolutionist whose influence has changed the history of the whole world.[1]

There are certainly many striking resemblances between Christianity and Mohammedanism. Both believe in the one eternal God; both accept the Old Testament; both believe in a revealed religion; both accept the historical person of Jesus; both believe in the doctrine of immortality; and both hold in common many of the highest moral virtues. Because of these resemblances to Judaism and Christianity it has been claimed that Islam is chiefly a transfusion of these two older religions into Arabian forms.[2] Just how far Mohammed was consciously and unconsciously influenced by these two faiths, with the chief tenets of which he was certainly acquainted, cannot be positively stated. From a Christian standpoint, however,

[1] Ockley, *Hist. of the Saracens;* Bahador, *Essays on the Life of Mohammed;* Prideaux, *Life of Mahomet;* Bush, *Life of Mohammed;* Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism;* Bate, *Studies in Islam;* Stobart, *Islam and its Founder;* Rodwell, *The Koran;* Palmer, *The Koran;* Sale, *The Koran;* etc.

[2] *Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1869.

Mohammedanism has a darker side. Polygamy is permitted, though regulated, and the marriage ties are exceedingly loose; consequently, woman occupies a very degraded position. Slavery is practised and encouraged. Islam commands war on all unbelievers and the intolerant spirit which this engenders is perhaps the darkest blot on that faith. When a comparison between the resemblances and differences is made, however, the former seem to far outnumber the latter.

The spread of Mohammedanism is one of the most remarkable things in history. The means used for this propagation was the sword and the justification is found in these words: "The sword is the key of heaven and hell; a drop of blood shed in the cause of Allah, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer; whosoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven and at the day of judgment his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim." Idolators were to be slain unmercifully, but Jews and Christians were given a limited toleration under tribute upon submission. Before his death (632) Mohammed had subdued all of Arabia. Under his successors a conquest was made of Palestine (637), Syria (638), and Persia (710) in Asia. To the westward in Africa Egypt was taken (647) and by 707 all northern Africa was captured; and from there the movement spread inland. Europe was invaded through Spain as early as 711 and the new faith was carried up to northern France where the Mohammedans were repulsed in 732 in the decisive battle of Tours. Meanwhile, as early as 672, an attack was made upon Constantinople, but it proved unsuccessful. Islands in the Mediterranean were taken and Italy was harassed for two centuries (9th to 11th). Sicily was seized (827), Rome invaded (846),

a colony planted at Bari (871), Salerno beseiged (873), Beneventum and Capua attacked (874), and the Eternal City sacked by Saracens under a Norman leader as late as 1085. In the eleventh century the Saracens still held southern Spain and all northern Africa while the Seljukian Turks had defeated the Saracens and had taken possession of the Holy Land. Thus "Mohammed, with a sword in one hand and the Koran in the other, erected his throne on the ruins of Christianity and of Rome."[1] The Bible and the Koran divided the world into two parts, separated by the Mediterranean but touching at the extremities. A conflict between these two great world forces, each one imbued with a fanatical desire to spread its teaching, was inevitable.

The Crusade movement was in a certain sense the high-water mark of the conflict. The causes of the Crusades were both positive and negative:—the latter will be taken up first and enumerated.

1. The spread of Islam and the consequent terror and hatred aroused in the Christians, as shown in Spain, France, Italy, and the Eastern Empire, produced a feeling in Europe that this great foe could be checked and thrust back only by the union of all European nations in a great holy war against their oppressors. This feeling was intensified by the fact that many Christians had been captured and sold into slavery.

2. The fall of the Holy Land, with all its sacred places, into the hands of the "infidels," first the Saracens and then the Turks, called forth a cry of horror and a vow of revenge from all Christendom. Roman paganism had followed the Roman conquest to Palestine early in the Christian era. By the fourth

[1] Gibbon, ch. 50.

century, however, the cross had triumphed over polytheism and Christian Emperors and pious persons erected splendid churches on the holy places. Constantine and his mother Helena built churches over the cave where Jesus was born, over the tomb where he was buried, and in other sacred spots. It was not long until the location of every place in the life of Jesus from his birth to his death was marked by a little shrine, or a chapel, or a costly church. At the same time many valuable relics were discovered such as the true cross and those of the two thieves, the lance, the sponge, the cup, the crown of thorns, the basin in which the disciples' feet were washed, the stone on which Jesus stood before Pilate, the manger in which Jesus was born, and many others. It was not long until there was a comparatively large Christian population in Palestine made up of the native Christians, the hermits and their followers, and the devout pilgrims who fairly swarmed to the Holy Land from all parts of Europe. The Persian King Chosroes II. in 611 captured Jerusalem, destroyed many churches, put ninety thousand Christians to death, and carried off the true cross. But Heraclius in 628 defeated the Persians, recovered the true cross and restored it to the Holy City (629).

The Saracens in 637 made a conquest of Palestine. These Mohammedans manifested a peculiar reverence for Jerusalem and gave the Christians perfect freedom on condition that the church bells should merely toll not ring, that converts to Islamism should be unmolested, and that the Christians should pay tribute, have a distinct name and language, acknowledge the political sovereignty of the Caliph, use no saddles and bear no arms, build no new churches, and remove

the cross from the outside of the church buildings. Under these restrictions the Christians lived in comparative security until Hakam, the mad Sultan of Egypt, in 1010 attempted to destroy Christianity in Jerusalem by razing the churches, killing many of the followers of Christ, levying a tax on all pilgrims, and through these acts inciting persecutions of the Jew in Europe where it was believed that he was responsible for this change. Jerusalem was captured in 1076 by the Seljukian Turks who destroyed the churches; robbed, insulted, and killed the Christians; replaced the lawful toll by extortion; brutally interrupted the sacred services; and dragged the holy patriarch through the streets by the hair and put him in a dungeon with the expectation of securing a ransom.

3. The enthusiasm for pilgrimages rapidly increased from the fourth to the twelfth century. This manifestation of religious reverence appears to have characterised all peoples at some stage of their religious history. Jerome says that Christians began to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem directly after the ascension. The desire to visit the scenes of the Saviour's life spread like a contagion—it became the mania of the Middle Ages—so that by the eleventh century a constant stream of pilgrims was going to and from the Holy Land. The journey was made by individuals[1] called "Palmers" who carried a staff, wallet, and scallop shell and for whom there was a special ceremony conducted by the local priest or the bishop both at departure and home-coming; by groups of monks, or of pupils under a teacher; and by whole multitudes such as the band of three thousand in 1054 and seven thousand in 1064. Among the pilgrims were found

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 336.

all classes—kings and beggars, male and female, priests and laity. They went either by routes overland or by sea. They were protected by laws and were cared for in institutions along the way. Through the endowment by pious individuals hospitals were built along the more popular routes. Monasteries served as hotels. The pilgrims were free from tolls and were granted many other privileges.[1] Charles the Great had them protected within his Empire and had a large hotel built for their accommodation at Jerusalem. It was believed by the faithful that such a pilgrimage had the efficacy of expiating all sin as a penance. A bath in the river Jordan was called a second baptism. The pilgrim who had braved all the hardships of a trip to the land of the Lord was upon his return a privileged character in the community. His shirt was sacredly preserved to be used for his shroud.

4. In addition to the hardships and difficulties of travel the pilgrim from the seventh to the eleventh century was subjected by the Mohammedan authorities to taxation and many indignities. Under the Turks after the eleventh century, robbery, cruelties of all sorts, and even murder with torture were common experiences. The report of these persecutions produced a marked effect on western Europe,—on the clergy, the ignorant and credulous laity, and the nobles and kings.[2]

5. The mercenary hope of reward offered by a Crusade against the Mohammedans was another powerful cause.[3] Merchants hoped to open up new fields for

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 337–340.

[2] Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages;* Milman, bk. vii., 224.

[3] Indulgences for fighting heathen had been offered long before this time. See Thatcher and McNeal, No. 276, 277.

commerce and trade.[1] Kings and princes expected to win rich provinces from the Turks. The Eastern Emperor desired to drive off a dangerous foe and to regain his lost domains in Asia Minor. The Pope and the bishops hoped to subject the Eastern Church in Palestine to the See of St. Peter. Merchants wished to recover the very lucrative trade with the East which had been lost through the Turkish conquests. Debtors and criminals desired to receive relief and pardon or to obtain wealth in plundering the "infidels." Sinners thought of obtaining complete pardon for past sins[2] and privileges for the future.

6. The militant spirit of the age and the love of war were aroused to fever heat by an unquenchable thirst for the blood of the enemies of Christianity.[3] Charles Martel and Charles the Great had set an example in the relentless warfare waged by them against the Mohammedans. After their time the Spanish nobles and kings kept up the good fight in heroic military expeditions. Otto the Great followed the example of Charles the Great in subduing the heathen of his frontiers by the sword. This spirit was aroused to almost ungovernable control by the many reports of cruelty reported on all sides by the returning pilgrims.

7. The credulity and superstition of western Europe were an important factor in producing the Crusades. The wildest legends were circulated concerning the barbarities and inhumanities of the Mohammedans, the miracles and deeds of valour, as well as the

[1] Cunningham, *Western Civilisation*, ii., 108.

[2] See Thatcher and McNeal, No. 274, 275.

[3] Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*, ii., 248; Oman, *The Art of War in the Middle Ages.*

shameless abuses, in the Holy Land. The "signs" of God's approbation of the Crusades, it was believed, were to be seen on every hand. Out of this same atmosphere grew up the shameless traffic in relics which was rampant in Europe and approved by the Church.[1] Relics from the Holy Land, associated in one way or another with the career of Jesus, were very numerous and of very great value. The Turkish conquest had had the effect of reducing the quantity of relics, but of increasing the price demanded.

Among the positive causes operating to produce the Crusades were:

1. The sincere zeal manifested by the Popes to extend the true faith.[2] Sylvester II. in 999 sounded the first trumpet calling upon the warriors of all Christendom to recover the Holy City of Jerusalem, but Pisa alone made some predatory incursions on the Syrian coast.[3] Gregory VII. wrote a circular letter to "all Christians" in 1074 urging them to drive the Turks out of Palestine.[4] He planned to rule the Eastern Church, pledged fifty thousand troops himself, and offered to lead the army in person, but the Norman Robert's eastern excursion (1081–1085) was the only fruit.[5] Victor III. preached a crusade in 1087 and promised a remission of sins to all who should take part, but he apparently had not yet struck the true crusading chord, for Pisa, Genoa, and Venice alone conducted a piratical expedition against the African

[1] *Revue de l'orient Latin*, 1897, 6–21.

[2] Burr, *The Year One Thousand and the Antecedents of the Crusades*, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, vol. vi.

[3] Duchesne, iii., 28th letter; Bouquet, ex 426; Muratori, iii., 400.

[4] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 278.

[5] Lib., i., 49; ii., 31–37; Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, i., 18, 46, 49; ii., 3, 31, 37.

coast. It was left to Urban II. to successfully launch the Crusade movement in 1095. He took advantage of the crusading spirit already abroad in Europe and called the Council of Piacenza (Italy), which was attended by four thousand clergy, thirty thousand laity, and envoys from the Eastern Emperor. In an eloquent address the Pope favoured a Crusade, but although many vows were taken, the enthusiasm did not seem sufficient to warrant the beginning of the undertaking.[1] Consequently another council was called to meet at Clermont in France about six months later. Urban himself was a Frenchman and believed that an appeal to his own people would meet with more success. There was a mighty throng at Clermont. After devoting seven days to Church affairs, the Pope closed the council by preaching his famous sermon in the open air to the impatient multitude. In its results this speech surpassed all others in the history of the world.[2] Swayed by its influence the whole multitude shouted, "God wills it! God wills it!" Then they rushed away to seize all the red cloth they could lay their hands on from which crosses were made to be sewed upon the bosoms of those who took the vow to wrest away from "The wicked race" the Holy Sepulchre. Knights and foot soldiers of all ranks now turned their attention to aid their fellow-Christians in the East and to punish the insolent Turks. August 15, 1096, was the day set for the Crusade. The Bishop of Pui, was made the Pope's legate and Raymond,

[1] Mansi, 801–815; Muratori, iii., 353; *Mon. Ger.*, v., 161; xii., 394; Jaffé, *Reg.*, i., 677.

[2] Mansi, xx., 815–919; Jaffé, *Reg.*, i., 681. Three versions of the speech may be found in U. of P. *Transl. and Reprints*, ii., No. 2, 4–5; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 279, 280; Robinson, *Readings*, vol. i., 312.

Count of Toulouse, was appointed to lead the laity.[1] The general absolution of all sins was promised; the "Truce of God" was proclaimed and general immunity and indulgence was given to debtors, criminals, and serfs.[2] Urban II. continued his travels and everywhere addressed the people urging them to join in the pious movement. His work must be regarded as the immediate cause of the Crusade.

2. The intense religious enthusiasm which had possessed Europe for two centuries, touching all classes and degenerating into fanaticism, was the fundamental cause. Chivalry made the Crusade a holy duty to the Church and furnished the noblest examples of devotion. The powerful reform spirit in the Church, growing out of Clugniac asceticism and the Hildebrandine reformation, was an important factor in the movement. The personal labours of some individuals supplemented the work so well started by Pope Urban II. Conspicuous among these was Peter the Hermit, who was formerly credited with having originated the whole Crusade movement, but who was never in Palestine before the Crusades, did not incite Urban, did not speak at Clermont, and did not stir up all Europe. His work was limited to a few months and to a small part of southern France, where he rode through the country on an ass carrying before him a great crucifix and dramatically appealing to the feelings of the people. His influence upon other parts of France, however, must have been considerable and he deserves much credit for having helped to call together the first army. Another enthusiast who laboured to spread the movement was Robert d'Ar-

[1] *Hist. Occid.*, iv., 16; Sybel, 228.
[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 281.

brissel.[1] In the Second Crusade this work was performed largely by Bernard of Clairvaux.

3. Thousands in Europe, actuated by honest motives such as the hope of securing spiritual benefits, the wish to expiate sins, the desire to extend Christianity, the yearning to convert the Mohammedans, and the determination to overthrow a grave enemy to western civilisation and progress, gave their means and their lives to this sacred undertaking. The cries for help which came from the Christians in Jerusalem and from the Eastern Emperor fell on sympathetic ears. All of these forces and causes, operating in various ways, produced the most remarkable manifestation of military power coupled with religious fervour which Europe had yet witnessed. It seemed as if Mohammedanism itself had spread the contagion of its own fanaticism to the followers of the Prince of Peace.[2]

In time the Crusades covered approximately two centuries from 1096 to 1291. They directly affected all Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia. They occurred in an age when Europe was decentralised politically by feudalism; imbued religiously with the ardour and ideals of Hildebrand; industrially almost wholly undeveloped; educationally ignorant and credulous; and socially controlled by monasticism and chivalry. In the Crusades there was an arrayal of pan-Christianity against pan-Mohammedanism, or European civilisation *versus* Asiatic civilisation. The Crusades were, broadly speaking, one great movement, with a series of waves, which held the world's destiny in its results and which was a natural manifestation of

[1] Pothast, *Bib. Hist.*, ii., 550.

[2] *Hist. Occid.*, iv., 12, 13, 135; *Mon. Ger.*, v., 161; xx., 248; xxi., 56.

the civilisation of the day both from the Christian and the Mohammedan sides. The purpose of the movement was primarily to wrest the Holy Land from the Mohammedans and to restore it to Christianity. But a great variety of secondary purposes and motives, both good and bad, induced people to co-operate in the enterprise. The devout, the romantic, the adventurous, the discontented, the mercenary, the criminal, and the sinner, all took part but for different reasons. From the standpoint of the primary purpose, the Crusades were a failure; but viewed from their effects on civilisation they were a success. It is difficult to reduce them to any specific number, though for the sake of clearness they may be divided into four major Crusades[1] and four minor Crusades,[2] with an unclassified children's Crusade. The idea of a Crusade had been developed by the conflict with the Moors in Spain, the heathen Saxons, the pagan Slavs, and various heretical sects; and it was employed, after the Crusades ended, in European history for some centuries to come.

The Council of Clermont met in November, 1095, and immediately thereafter enthusiastic preparations were begun for the First Crusade.[3] From March to June

[1] Major Crusades:
(1) 1096–1099—led by knights of France and the Normans.
(2) 1147–1149—led by kings of France and Germany.
(3) 1189–1192—led by kings of France, England, and Germany.
(4) 1202–1204—led by French nobles and the Doge of Venice.

[2] Minor Crusades:
(1) 1216–1220.
(2) 1228–1229.
(3) 1248–1254.
(4) 1270–1272.

[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 282, 283; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 316; Ogg, §52.

of the following year, the rabble vanguard was collecting in France and along the Rhine—a motley crowd of peasants, artisans, vagabonds, and even women and children, all fanatically intent upon rescuing the Holy Sepulchre two thousand miles away and confident that God would protect them on the way and grant them victory.[1] This miscellaneous throng was entirely lacking in leadership and organisation. It broke up into a number of divisions united only by their common zeal and similar purpose. Walter the Penniless at the head of fifteen thousand, among whom were only eight horsemen, appears to have led the band. After encountering many difficulties in Hungary and overcoming grave dangers in Bulgaria, they at length arrived at Constantinople. Peter the Hermit with forty thousand Crusaders separated from Walter at Cologne, and followed the course of the Danube. The Hungarians almost annihilated these pious robbers so that Peter with difficulty escaped with but one fifth of his followers and reached Constantinople only through the protection afforded them by the Eastern Emperor. Emico, Count of Leiningen, conducted twenty thousand Germans, and Gotschalk, the monk, had about fifteen thousand.[2] On the heels of these various advanced divisions followed a rabble of two hundred thousand among whom were three thousand mounted knights. This unorganised vanguard was apparently well received in Constantinople by Emperor Alexius, who hurried them across the Bosphorus only to meet their destruction at the hand of Sultan David in front of Nicæa. Peter the Hermit and with him a band of three thousand were fortunate enough to escape.

[1] Ogg, § 52.

[2] Giesebrecht, iii., 656.

Meanwhile the main body of the Crusaders was collecting, mostly in France, because the other nations of Europe were either preoccupied or had little enthusiasm for the movement. The leaders were nobles and not kings.[1] From the north went forth Godfrey of Bouillon, a wise and brave man who with his brothers Eustace and Baldwin led thirty thousand foot and ten thousand horse from France and Germany; Hugh the Long, brother of Philip I.; Robert of Normandy, son of William the Conqueror; Robert of Flanders, "the sword and the lance" of the Crusades; Stephen of Chartres, the richest prince of France; and a large number of minor nobles. From the south came Bohemond, the son of Robert Guiscard, already experienced in eastern warfare; Tancred, a cousin of Bohemond, the model knight and hero of the movement; Raymond of Toulouse, old in war, brave, greedy, and proud, who led one hundred and sixty thousand foot and horse; Adhemar, Bishop of Pui, the first bishop to take the cross and the official representative of the Pope; and many subordinate noblemen. This vast multitude, estimated at one million Crusaders, chiefly French, represented the flower of western Europe. Whole families, especially of the nobles, arranged to join the undertaking. This immense throng was organised on feudal lines. The dukes, counts, and barons were the overlords and rulers and divided the army into parts. Under them served the knights on horseback and clothed in their long coats of mail. They supplied the military spirit and imbued the common people with a holy zeal. Each knight was accompanied by his squire and a squad of warriors. Four different routes were taken by the Crusaders: (1)

[1] Gibbon, ch. 58.

Hugh, the Roberts, and Stephen went from the Alps to Apulia, where they were met and blessed by the Pope, then separated, and made a scramble by land and sea for Constantinople. Hugh was held as prisoner by Emperor Alexius until he recognised the feudal sovereignty of the Eastern Emperor. (2) Godfrey traversed Germany, Hungary, and Bulgaria and reached Constantinople at Christmas time, 1096, where he made a compact with Alexius. (3) Bohemond took the sea route to the eastern capital. He was incensed at the compromise made by his colleagues with the Eastern Emperor, but was finally won over by bribery. (4) Raymond, the last to set out, went *via* Lombardy, Dalmatia, and Slavonia, but was greatly hindered by the hostility of the natives incited by Alexius, to whom Raymond, upon learning of his treachery, refused homage.

The policy of the Eastern Emperor Alexius in dealing with the Crusaders appears to have been a double one. He had called on the West for aid against the Turks and was answered by an armed horde that threatened to sweep away his very throne. He had easily rid himself of the rabble vanguard by sending them to their doom in Asia Minor. He was determined now, if possible, to impede the march of these new forces toward Constantinople. Not succeeding in that he attempted to compel them to swear fealty to him and then to use them to drive back the Turks and to restore his lands. He was a master diplomat and politician and soon hurried the Crusaders across the Bosphorus. They laid seige to Nicæa and in June, 1097, it fell. After the battle of Dorylæum (July 4, 1097), Antioch was captured in June, 1098. In July of the following year (1099) came the storming of

Jerusalem and its capture with the accompanying massacre of the Mohammedans and Jews. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was created and Godfrey was elected Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. With him was left a guard of defence consisting of two hundred knights and two thousand archers. A comparatively small number of Crusaders, who had survived the hardships of the three years' campaign, then returned home.[1]

The occasion and cause of the Second Crusade was the fall of Edessa in 1145 into Mohammedan hands. Jerusalem was next threatened by the Moslems and was in grave danger of meeting a similar fate. The western Christians, inspired by thrilling accounts of the survivers of the First Crusade, and actuated by the usual variety of motives, were eager to imitate the earlier heroes. Great enthusiasm was aroused through the preaching of St. Bernard[2] (b. 1091–d. 1153), the son of a Burgundian knight slain in the First Crusade, and a fanatic in ascetic severities, who, when Edessa fell, had been commissioned by the Pope to preach a Crusade. His fiery addresses, kindling a crusading mania in France and Germany, were supplemented by a letter from Pope Eugenius III. to western Christendom.[3] The leaders of the Second Crusade were Louis VII. of France and Conrad III. of Germany, who rallied their forces at Mainz and Ratisbon. Conrad III. took

[1] Ders, *Med. Topog. of Palestine;* Condor, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.* See letters of Crusaders in Robinson, *Readings*, i., 321; *Transl. and Reprints*, i., No. iv.; Ogg, § 53.

[2] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 330; Mabillon, *Life and Letters of St. Bernard.*

[3] Storrs, *Bernard of Clairvaux;* Morison, *The Life and Times of St. Bernard;* Thatcher and McNeal, No. 284; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 337.

the old route through Hungary and crossed to Asia without entering Constantinople, because he suspected the duplicity of the Eastern Emperor. After him came the French over the same ground. Nothing was accomplished, however, and after a miserable failure the monarchs with their few survivors returned home.

The occasion for the Third Crusade was the capture of Jerusalem in 1187 by Saladin, the bravest and most honoured of all the Saracen rulers. Once more Europe was aroused to a pitch of pious frenzy.[1] The leadership of the enterprise was assumed by Richard I. of England, Philip Augustus of France, and Frederick Barbarossa of Germany. In England Richard I. prepared for the undertaking by selling tithes, royal dignities, and lands; by robbing the Jews; by taxing all classes[2]; and by even threatening to sell the city of London. Equal zeal was shown in France and Germany. Richard and Philip with one hundred thousand men took the sea route from Marseilles and Genoa, while Frederick took the usual overland route. Frederick Barbarossa met his death in this pious undertaking and this led to the failure of the German effort. The estrangement of Richard and Philip resulted, after the fall of Acre, July 12, 1191, in the return of Philip to France. Richard alone remained and succeeded in 1192 in concluding a truce with Saladin by which Christian pilgrims were permitted to visit the holy places with safety and comfort.[3]

The Fourth Crusade was due largely to the personal

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 285.

[2] Henderson, *Hist. Docs. of the Mid. Ages*, 135.

[3] Richard had a very romantic adventure in returning to England. For his prowess see Colby, *Source Book*, 68–70.

influence of Innocent III.[1] Additional causes were the abortive effort of Emperor Henry VI. (1196–1197) and the preaching of the priest Fulk, of Neuilly. The leaders of the movement at the outset were French nobles, who lacked money with which to finance the enterprise and therefore made a contract with the Venetians who agreed to supply ships and food for a stipulated sum.[2] But when the Crusaders reached Venice, being unable to raise the amount agreed upon, the Venetians proposed that in lieu of the payment the Crusaders assist in reducing to submission the rebellious city of Zara. That was accomplished in November, 1202, in the face of papal opposition, and then the expedition moved on to the capture and sack of Constantinople in April, 1204. The Latin Empire of Constantinople was then created and a Venetian elected as patriarch, but the Holy Land was not even reached. Of all the Crusades this appears to have been the most mercenary and the least fruitful of results.[3]

Of the minor Crusades the fifth was inspired by the zeal of Pope Innocent III.; the sixth was due to the ambition of Emperor Frederick II.; the seventh was occasioned by the fall of Jerusalem and the pious enthusiasm of Louis IX.[4]; and the eighth resulted from the vow of Louis IX. and a dream of Prince Edward. The leaders of these later Crusades were all kings. The

[1] Henderson, *Hist. Docs. of the Mid. Ages*, 337; *Transl. and Rep.*, iii., No. 1.

[2] *Transl. and Rep.*, iii., No. 1, pp. 6–17.

[3] Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople;* Oman, *Byzantine Empire;* Finlay, *Hist. of Greece;* Gibbon, ch. 60; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 286, 287, 288; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 338.

[4] Perry, *St. Louis;* Davis, *The Invasion of Egypt in A. D. 1241 by Louis IX.*

fifth and seventh resulted in defeat and failure in Egypt; the sixth captured Jerusalem and a few other cities; the eighth recovered Nazareth and secured a treaty favourable to Christians. The end of the Crusade period practically came when in 1291 Acre, the last city held by the Christians, was captured by the Mohammedans. The later Popes of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries repeatedly called upon Christendom to arm against the Moslems. Several of the kings of France even took the cross and proclaimed Crusades, but it was done usually only to squeeze a tax out of the people. The Crusades had failed after millions in life and money had been lost. The people at length lost faith in the movement. Crusades in Europe, not so dangerous as those against the Holy Land, were declared to be as efficacious as those of a more hazardous character. The rise of national states kept kings and subjects occupied at home. International relations made it dangerous for countries to send huge armies abroad. There had come about a gradual decline of fanatical crusading zeal—"The flame of fanaticism had slowly burned out." The religious needs were now satisfied by the relics, Gethsemanes, Via Dolorosas, and Calvaries found in Europe. The sale of indulgences made it unnecessary to go to Jerusalem to win religious peace for sinful souls. The marvellous development of Europe in every direction caused her to forget all about the Holy War and left no surplus energy for such far-away undertakings. The warrior became the trader.

The failure of the Crusade movement was due to many influences. There was an utter lack of organisation and the various movements seemed lawless and mob-like, due perhaps to the feudalistic basis.

The able leaders were too few and the frequent petty quarrels among those in command demoralised the forces. The common good was sacrificed in too many cases to personal, political, and commercial greed. The struggle between the German Emperor and the Pope prevented concerted action on the part of Europe. The treachery and inactivity of the Eastern Emperor had much to do with the final outcome. The difficulty of colonising so large an area and of absorbing the Mohammedan population, or of even controlling it, was an important factor in the result. Then, too, the strength and activity of the Mohammedan forces, an element usually overlooked, played no small part. As time passed the gradual indifference and the loss of interest in the enterprise account for the unfortunate ending.

The Crusades are not so important because of the character of the movement, but because of the significance of their results and influences.[1] Perhaps the most important results were along religious lines. Temporarily the Latin Church was extended to the Holy Land and Constantinople, while the Pope was made the head of united Christendom, although ultimately the breach between the Greek and Latin churches was widened and never again effectually healed. The Crusade movement enabled Innocent III. to largely attain the ideal of Hildebrand as absolute master of Christendom. The longest, bloodiest, and most destructive religious war in all history was originated by the head of the Church. Through the power thus gained the Pope was able to make himself the dictator of Emperors, kings, and nobles. As never before he regulated the life of all Europe for two centuries and

[1] Guizot, *Hist. of Civ. in Europe*, Lect. 8; Kitchin, *Hist. of France*.

created a religious enthusiasm which sanctioned all his acts and pretensions. The wealth of the Church was multiplied through the foreclosing of countless mortgages; through large gifts from the living and the dying; and through conquests of lands and cities. Many innovations were introduced into the Church. The legatine power of the Pope was developed; bishops *in partibus in fidelium* were appointed in the East and after the failure of the Crusades fled to Rome where they were made vicar-generals; the sale of indulgences became a regular traffic; heretics in Europe were dealt with by crusades and the Inquisition; and the Mohammedan idea of salvation was introduced. The Crusades brutalised the Church and developed the spirit of intolerance, bigotry, and persecution. For two hundred years the deeds of the Crusaders were sanctioned by the Pope as pleasing to God. The persecution of Jews in Europe was somewhat common and apparently approved of by the Church.[1] Certain it is that the Pope ordered crusades in Europe against heretics, like the Albigenses, and instituted the Inquisition to suppress them; against pagans in the north-east; and against one refractory prince by another.

Superstition and credulity were increased and the traffic in relics was something enormous. "The Western world was deluged by corporeal fragments of departed saints." "Every city had a warehouse of the dead." A belief in the miraculous and in the number of miracles was greatly increased. The worship of saints and of images became so wide-spread and general that there was a veritable craze for the shrines of saints and pilgrimages in Europe were greatly multiplied.

[1] Neubauer and Stern, *Hebräische Berichts über die Judenverfolgungen während des Kreuzzüge.*

Through the Crusades monasticism and chivalry were combined to form new religious orders like the Hospitalers, Templars, and Teutonic Knights. A marked effect was left upon the theology of the Middle Ages. The "Suffering Christ" developed, as is seen in the pictures and crucifixes, because hundreds of thousands had seen where Christ was born and crucified and hence had excited the imagination of western Europe. The Crusades led likewise to a reformation within the Church by producing a general intellectual awakening, by sanctioning many abuses which soon produced a reaction, and by leading to a denunciation of all the corruption of the Church developed through its wealth and power. This reformation was carried on largely by the Franciscans and Dominicans. Mohammedanism was prevented from making further aggressions on Europe for nearly four centuries and many Christians came to regard that faith more sympathetically, if not with some degree of respect, for the Koran was translated into Latin in the middle of the twelfth century.[1]

Politically the Crusades settled the question whether Europe or Asia should rule the world. They failed to free the Holy Land, but did free Europe from Islam. They established the western rule in the East at least temporarily, first in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099–1291) and secondly in the Latin Kingdom of Constantinople. They prolonged the life of the Eastern Empire three hundred and fifty years and taught the Greeks to use the Latin methods of warfare. For a time at least they subjected the political powers of Europe to the Papacy under Innocent III., but

[1] The results of the Crusades ought to be viewed also from the Mohammedan side.

a reaction soon followed. They helped the rise of national states on a monarchial basis. Kings were able to emphasise national unity and to increase their power and popularity by leading Crusades in person. Many powerful feudal lords, who divided sovereign power with the king, were killed or returned impoverished and were unable to recover their power. Patriotism was developed and national hatreds accentuated. The abolition of private wars through the "Truce of God" promoted the growth of nationality. By the close of the period Spain, France, and England were well on their way toward the rise of a national state, while even Germany and Italy felt the yearnings of nationality. The Crusades tended to overthrow feudalism by the death of so many feudal lords; by detaining some of the most powerful as rulers in the East; by causing the loss of property through unredeemed mortgages; by the increasing power of kings; by the rise of free cities; by the emancipation of serfs and vassals; by the formation of standing armies; and by the new civilisation which resulted. Since the Crusades were European movements against a common foe, a new meaning was given to international relations. For two hundred years after the close of the holy wars Europe was blessed with international peace. The respect and hatred of each nation for the others were strengthened by the associations and quarrels of kings and peoples. The estrangement between the Eastern Empire and the West became more pronounced. Many important changes were made in the art and practice of war.[1] There was a marked revival of the study of law as a result of the creation of law colleges and court lawyers soon became numerous and powerful. The freedom

[1] Oman, *Art of War in the Middle Ages.*

of the common people was promoted by the overthrow of the feudal system; by the growth of free towns and cities which usually formed an alliance with the crown against the nobles; and by the emancipation from serfdom which resulted from assuming the cross. The kings, as a matter of self-interest, championed the cause of the common people. Louis VII. of France (1131–1180) declared that all men had "A certain natural liberty, only to be forfeited through crime." Bologna in 1256 gave liberty to all within her walls because "None but the free should dwell in a free city." Florence in 1280 followed the example of Bologna. Louis X. in 1315 enfranchised all since "By the law of nature all ought to be free." And Philip VI. (1293–1350) made the same declaration "In the name of equality and natural liberty." A similar wave was felt in England.[1] The House of Commons, created in England in 1295, marks the beginning of representative government and in 1302 the third estate was given a voice in France.

Intellectually western Europe was far behind the Greeks and Arabs in education, culture, literature, science, and art, hence intercourse for two hundred years with these peoples made a marked difference in European civilisation. The minds of the Crusaders were liberalised by seeing different peoples, lands, customs, and civilisations often superior to their own. The fanatical hate and bigotry of the early Crusades were modified by coming to know the Mohammedan religion and the eastern ideas.[2]

The knowledge of the West was increased in geo-

[1] Stubbs, ii., 128.

[2] Prutz, *Kulturgesch. der Kreuzzüge;* Draper, *Intel. Develop. of Europe*, ch. 11, 13, 16.

graphy and led indirectly to travels eastward by Marco Polo and westward by Columbus, Magellan, De Gama, and others; in sociology, trade, agriculture, and manufacturing; in political science; in mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, zoölogy, medicine and drugs; in literature by bringing back traditions about great events like the fall of Troy, tales of heroes like Solomon and Alexander the Great, reports about crusading deeds of valour, an infinite number and variety of miracles, saintly tales, and pious acts, and Greek books like Aristotle and Arabic poetry translated into Latin; in art and architecture by carrying Eastern styles and types to western Europe. The Crusaders preserved the monuments of Greek learning from destruction at the hands of the Turks until western Europe was advanced enough to receive and appreciate them, though, as a rule, the Crusaders disdained the language and literature of both Arabs and Greeks. The Latin language was again diffused over Greece and Palestine. Indirectly the Crusades produced the Renaissance.

The social results, while not so immediate and pronounced, were nevertheless very important. The destruction of feudalism tended to break down social barriers and draw social extremes more closely together; to abolish many social abuses; and to improve the social condition of the masses. The rise of free cities tended to associate social equality with municipal liberty. Through the Crusades serfs were emancipated by assuming the cross; by being made day labourers in the absence of free men; and by passing into the hands of free cities, the Church, or the king. At the same time social distinctions and barriers were weakened by making all Crusaders members of a common army under the Pope and by the common enthusiasm, experiences,

dangers, and long continued association of all classes. Chivalry, too, was developed in its best form and through it originated many of our noblest social virtues and sentiments. The wealth, the luxuries, and the ornamental and useful arts brought from the East added greatly to the comfort and happiness of the West. Through this movement many valuable charitable institutions were likewise created. It must not be forgotten, however, that the death of hundreds of thousands in these holy wars left sorrow and poverty in many homes and filled western Europe with widows and orphans. The debtor and criminal classes were given a chance to gain wealth and salvation in a popular cause and eagerly embraced the opportunity. The Crusades also gave rise to such great socialistic movements as the begging orders, the Pastoraux led by the Hungarians in 1251, the Flagellants (1259), and the Albigenses.[1]

Industrially the material welfare of stagnant western Europe was increased by the great impulse given to trade and by the widening of commercial relations. Through trading with the East, acting as the mediums of distribution for northern and western Europe, and supplying the needs of the Crusaders, cities like Venice, Pisa, and Genoa became immensely rich. The cities of Germany, France, and England in turn became secondary centres of trade. The Hanseatic League was formed in the thirteenth century. Manufacturing received a strong impetus; shipbuilding flourished, and factories for armour and arms and leather and cloth goods sprang up. These new branches of industry were found chiefly in the free cities where they were controlled by the guilds. Agriculture and horti-

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 269, 272.

culture were much improved by new plants, grains, and fruits from the East and by the importation of such useful aids as the windmill and the mule. Fortunes were lost by the nobles and amassed by the Church, the Jews, the free cities, and the kings. The coinage system was improved and banking appears to have been for the first time introduced. The militant spirit of the nation was aroused and for two centuries war was made the chief occupation of Europe.[1]

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—*Chronicles of the Crusades.* Bohn, *Antiq. Lib.*, Lond., 1848.
2.—*Early Travels in Palestine.* *Ib.*
3.—*Marco Polo's Travels.* *Ib.*
4.—Roger of Hovenden, *Annals of English History* (to 1201). *Ib.*
5.—Roger of Wendover, *Flowers of History* (to 1235). *Ib.*
6.—Matthew Paris, *English History* (1235–1273). *Ib.*
7.—Matthew of Westminster, *Flowers of History* (to 1307). *Ib.*
8.—William of Malmesbury, *Chronicles of the Kings of England* (to Stephen). *Ib.*
9.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1892.
10.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints*, i., No. 2 and 4; iii., No. 1.
11.—*Palestine Pilgrim Text Society.* Lond., 1897 *ff.*, 14 vols.
12.—Pinkerton, J., *A General Collection . . . of Travels.* Lond., 1808–14, 17 vols.
13.—William of Tyre, *Godeffray of Boloyne or the Siege and Conquest of Jerusalem.* Tr. by W. Caxton, 1481. Ed. by M. N. Colvin. Lond., 1893.

[1] The results of the Crusades may with profit be classified as (1) positive and negative, (2) direct and indirect, (3) immediate and remote, and (4) permanent and transitory.

14.—Purchas, S., *A Supplement of the Holy Land Story* (from Wm. of Tyre). Lond., 1625.
15.—Archer, T. A., *The Crusade of Richard I.* (1189–92). N. Y., 1888.
16.—Robinson, *Readings in European History*, i., ch. 15.
17.—Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book of Mediæval History*, 510.
18.—Ogg, *Source Book of Mediæval History*, N. Y., 1908.

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Archer, T. A., and Kingsford, C. L., *The Crusades*. N. Y., 1894.
2.—Balzani, U., *The Popes and the Hohenstauffen*. Lond., 1889.
3.—Conder, C. R., *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (1099–1291). Lond., 1897.
4.—Cox, G. W., *The Crusades*. N. Y., 1879.
5.—Douglas, A. M., *The Heroes of the Crusades*. Bost., 1889.
6.—Dutton, W. E., *History of the Crusades*. Lond., 1877.
7.—Frith, H., *Story of the Crusades*. N. Y., 1885.
8.—Gibbon, E., *History of the Crusades* (1095–1216). Lond., 1880.
9.—Gray, G. E., *The Crusade of the Children in the Thirteenth Century*. N. Y., 1870.
10.—Heeren, A. H. L., *Essay on the Influence of the Crusades*.
11.—Keeling, A. E., *The Nine Famous Crusades of the Middle Ages*. Lond., 1889.
12.—Keightley, T., *The Crusades*. 2 vols. Lond., 1847.
13.—Lane-Poole, *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*. N. Y., 1898.
14.—Ludlow, J. M., *The Age of the Crusades*. N. Y., 1897.
15.—Merrill, G. E., *Crusades and Captives*. Bost., 1890.
16.—Michaud, J. F., *History of the Crusades*. 3 vols. N. Y., 1881.
17.—Mills, C., *History of the Crusades*. Lond., 1828.

18.—Mombert, J. I., *A Short History of the Crusades.* N. Y., 1894.
19.—Neal, J. M., *Stories of the Crusades.* Lond., 1848.
20.—Oman, C. W. C., *The Art of War in the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1885.
21.—Pears, E., *The Fall of Constantinople.* N. Y., 1886.
22.—Perry, G. G., *History of the Crusades.* Lond., 1872.
23.—Porter, W., *A History of the Knights of Malta.* Lond., 1883.
24.—Proctor, G., *History of the Crusades.* Phil., 1854.
25.—Storrs, R.S., *Bernard of Clairvaux.* N.Y.,1892.
26.—Sybel, H. von, *History and Literature of the Crusades.* Lond., 1861.
27.—Winslow, M. E., *The Fate of the Innocents: a Romance of the Crusades.* Phil., 1889.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, *Civ. dur. M. A.*, ch. 11. *Med. Civ.*, ch. 9. Allen, ii., ch. 4. Alzog, ii., 371–376. Ameer Ali, *Short Hist. of Saracens*, 320, 359. Bryce, 164, 191, 205, 301, 326, 341. Chantrel, per. 4 ch. 1, 2. Coxe, lect. 5, sec. 12–14. Creighton, ch. 1. Darras, iii., 137, 162, 243, 299, 330, 346, 357, 370, 394, 397. Döllinger, iii., per. 4, ch. 2; iv., per. 4, ch. 3. Emerton, ch. 11. Fisher, 186, 188, 191, 193, 194, 196, 201, 225, 230, 231. Foulkes, ch. 11. Gibbon, v., ch. 58; vi., ch. 59–61. Gieseler, iii. Gilmartin, ii., ch. 8, 9. Greenwood, bk. xi., ch. 4, 5; bk. xiii., ch. 5. Gregorovius. Guizot, *Hist. of Fr.*, ch. 16, 17. *Hist. of Civ.* Hase, sec. 183, 187, 190. Hore, ch. 14. Hurst, i., ch. 43. Knight, ch. 13–16. Kurtz, ii., 14–20. Milman, bk. vii., ch. 6; bk. ix., ch. 7; bk. x., ch. 3. Moeller, ii., 245, 248. Mosheim, bk. iii., pt. 1, ch. 2 (11th cent.); bk. iii., pt. 1, ch. 1 (12th cent.); bk. iii., pt. 1, ch. 1 (13th cent.). Neander, iv., 51, 59, 103, 123–128, 152. Robertson, iv., 47, 194, 380, 385, 412; v., 132, 211, 241; vi., 59, 81. Robinson, ch. 15. Tout, *Emp. and Papacy*, ch. 7, 8, 13, 15, 19.

CHAPTER XXI

RISE OF THE MENDICANT ORDERS IN THE CHURCH

OUTLINE: I.—Monasticism before the Crusades. II.—Effect of the Crusades on monasticism. III.—Origin of the begging orders. IV.—Rise and influence of the Dominicans. V.—Origin and power of the Franciscans. VI.—Wide-spread results of mediæval monasticism. VII.—Sources.

THE rise of monasticism[1] and the monastic reformation[2] have already been considered. The spirit of the Clugniac and Hildebrandine reformation was projected into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries through new monastic orders.

1. The order of Grammont, founded by Stephen of Tigerno in 1073 with the sanction of Gregory VII., spread rapidly over France as a reform society. The order lived under an oral rule until 1143, when it was written out by Stephen of Lisiac. Revised under Innocent III., the rule lasted until the seventeenth century. The order included more lay than spiritual brethren, also had three women's cloisters, and was generally recognised as a reform organisation.[3]

2. The Carthusians, founded at Chartreuse near Grenoble in 1084 by Bruno of Cologne, were peculiarly ascetic. They still boast that their order is the only one never reformed.

[1] See Ch. XI.
[2] See Ch. XVIII.
[3] Migne, vol. 204, pp. 1005–1046.

3. The order of Fontevraud, founded for both monks and nuns in 1093 by Robert of Arbrissel in Poitou, sent its members through the country preaching penance and practising rigidly ascetic lives.

4. The Cistercians, founded at Citeaux near Dijon in Burgundy in 1098 by Robert of Molesme, a Benedictine abbot, who, despairing of reforming the loose and frivolous life of the old order, resolved to found a new one for the purpose of leading a life of austere asceticism. The order spread rapidly and reached its culmination in the thirteenth century, when its cloisters numbered eight hundred.[1] In opposition to the wealthy monasteries about them, the Cistercians had unpretentious buildings, simple furniture, plain clothing, no pictures, images, or decorations, and a brief, unpretentious ritual. The greatest man in the order was St. Bernard[2] and under his leadership heretics like Abélard, Arnold of Brescia, and the Cathari were crushed, and the Second Crusade was preached.[3]

5. The order of Prémontré founded by St. Norbert in 1121—the only German originator of a monastic order after Bruno and who was converted from a rich worldly canon to a pious monk,—combined the life of monk and canon, soon spread through all countries, and had at one time a thousand abbeys for males and five hundred for females. The rules were those of Augustine, the religious practices were as severe, flesh was altogether forbidden as food, and fasts and scourgings were frequent. Norbert dressed himself in plain sheep skins and walked about barefooted

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, bk. viii., ch. 4.

[2] Mabillon, *Life and Letters*, 2 vols.; Ogg, §43, 44

[3] Storrs, *Bernard of Clairvaux;* Eales, *St. Bernard;* Eales, *The Works of St. Bernard*, 4 vols. See Chap. XX.

among the poor people preaching and teaching. In 1126 he was appointed Archbishop of Magdeburg, where he carried on the reforms so dear to his heart.

6. The Gilbertines, an order originated in 1148 by Gilbert, an English ecclesiastic of noble origin, and intended at first for women only but later opened to men, planted many cloisters throughout England with poorhouses, hospitals, and orphanages attached.[1]

7. The Celestines, founded by Pope Celestine V. in 1294, spread over Italy, France, and the Netherlands.

8. The Humiliati, founded by John Oldratus, a nobleman of Milan (died 1159), included men and women in the same house. This order was the outgrowth of the pietistic-socialistic movement in northern Italy and was a pronounced forerunner of the begging orders.

9. The Serviten, founded in 1233 at Florence by seven devotees who consecrated themselves to the Virgin Mary, spread to France, the Netherlands, and Germany and in 1424 was given the privileges of a begging order.

The Crusades produced two new forms of monasticism —the military orders and the convents of women established on the basis of useful activity and not idle contemplation. The military orders were a peculiar union of monk and knight whose purpose was, through charity and war, to protect pilgrims to the Holy Land, to care for the sick and to feed and house the tired and hungry.

1. The order of St. John had its origin in a hospital founded in 1065 at Jerusalem for sick pilgrims of both sexes by Maurus, a rich man of Amalfi. A master and lay brethren conducted it. In 1099, after the victory of

[1] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

the First Crusade, many knights joined it, hence to the hospital duties was now added armed protection for pilgrims. Soon a new and larger hospital was built near the church of St. John the Baptist from which the order was named. In 1121 Raymond de Puy gave the brotherhood a fixed rule which required the vows of monasticism, ascetic practices, and the duty of armed protection.[1] The order had two thousand members by 1160 and had received great wealth from Popes, princes, and private persons. Soon many affiliated branches were planted on land and on islands of the sea. In the thirteenth century the total income of the order was eighteen times as great as that of the King of France. After 1187 the order withdrew to Ptolemais and kept up the contest with the Saracens for a century when in 1291 it again withdrew first to the Isle of Cyprus, then in 1309 to the Isle of Rhodes, and, finally, in 1350 to the Isle of Malta where it remained until disbanded in 1797 by Napoleon.

2. Two companions of Godfrey of Bouillon in 1118 united with seven other knights to protect and guide pilgrims to the Holy Land. To the three monastic vows which they took was added a fourth, namely, to fight the "infidels." King Baldwin II. gave them a residence in the Temple of Solomon, hence the order came to be called the Templars.[2] The membership soon increased and a rule was drawn up. St. Bernard championed the order and Pope Honorius II. favoured it. Burghers soon joined the knights, but the hospital duties were obscured by the feats of arms. They withdrew in 1291 to Cypress and then to France where

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 266. Privileges granted by Anastasius IV. in 1154.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No, 265a.

through royal and papal favours they soon numbered twenty thousand knights and possessed vast wealth. Under Philip IV. of France they were disbanded and robbed in 1307.

3. The Teutonic Knights date from the Third Crusade and derived their name from a German hospital founded in 1128 at Jerusalem, which fell in 1187. The intense sufferings at the siege of Acre in 1190 led some of the German merchants to revive the work of the hospital by making tents out of the sails of their ships and caring for the sick. In 1200 these hospital attendants organised themselves as a military order, adopted monastic vows, promised to help the sick and wounded, bound themselves to fight the Mohammedans and pagans, and were soon favoured by the Pope and Emperor. At first the members were all Germans of honourable birth but later priests and burghers were admitted. The order became powerful and wealthy and in 1237 absorbed the order of Brothers of the Sword. The order removed first to Venice in 1291, and then to Marienburg in 1309 to wage a crusade against the pagan Prussians. Napoleon in 1809 suppressed the order. In Spain to fight the Moors were organised the order of Calatrava, the order of Aleontera, and the order of Montesta. In Portugal appeared the order of Christ and the order of Avis.

The hospital orders without military service arose in the West and were brotherhoods of common people patterned after the order of St. John and patronised by Popes:

1. The order of Cross Bearers arose in 1160 at Bologna and in 1238 in Bohemia.

2. The order of Anthony was endowed by a French noble and authorised by Urban II. in 1095 at Clermont.

3. The order of the Holy Ghost was founded at Montpellier in 1170 and regularly organised by Innocent III. in 1198.

4. The order of St. Lazarus probably began in the Holy Land and in the twelfth century spread over the West.

5. The order of the Trinity was created by a priest and a hermit and chartered in 1198 by Innocent III.

6. The order of Knights of Emancipation was formed in 1228 to free Christian slaves.

7. The Bridge Brothers were pledged to build and protect bridges for pilgrims as well as to care for the sick.

8. Various associations of women were attached to both classes of orders to serve in poorhouses and hospitals as nurses and assistants of all kinds.

This rapid multiplication of orders and their marvellous increase of wealth was followed by equally rapid degeneration and decay, so that the original purpose of the monastic organisation was lost after a few generations. The Popes granted them many exemptions. The members of these various orders became more estranged from the humbler classes and were in consequence unpopular, suspected, and hated. The vows of poverty were eluded; the narrow cell became a grand cloister; the deserts became parks, and the hermits, princely abbots; and the inmates of the monastery changed into a worldly aristocracy under a religious name. The promise of chastity was forgotten, the abbeys became centres of corruption and the nunneries almost houses of prostitution.[1] Monasticism resembled feudalism in which the abbot and his monks lived riotously and waged war upon their

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Sacer. Celib.*

neighbours. Such men as Gilbert, the Abbot of Gemblours, confessed with shame that monachism had become an oppression and a scandal—a hissing and a reproach to all men.[1] St. Bernard said in 1147 of the region of the Count of Toulouse:

> The churches are without people, the people are without priests, the priests without the reverence due them, and the Christians without Christ. The churches are regarded as synagogues, the sanctuary of the Lord is no longer holy; the sacraments are no longer held sacred; feast days are without solemnity; men die in their sins and their souls are hurried to the dread tribunal, neither reconciled by penance nor fortified by the holy communion.[2]

Furthermore the state and the nobility stepped in and attempted to control the monastic system and particularly the appointment of abbots.[3] The obligation of obedience to superior authority seemed to be utterly disregarded.

The old form of monasticism, at its best, thought only of the salvation of its own members and not of the world. Here, then, was an opportunity for a great revolution and also a crying need for it. Everywhere monasteries were rapidly obtaining exemptions from the bishops and subjecting themselves to the successor of St. Peter. While this strengthened the Pope, it stimulated conventual degeneracy, relaxed monastic discipline, denationalised monasticism, aroused popular hostility, and spread the report that a little gold would purchase any privilege.[4] Under these conditions it was perhaps natural that the inmates of monasteries

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 39, 53, 54.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 70.
[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 267.
[4] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 35.

were frequently recruited from the worst and most vicious classes. Such motives as sickness, poverty, crime, mortal danger, dread of hell, and desire of heaven would not furnish the best class of devotees.[1] In one French cloister the inmates were all professional highway robbers. Furthermore, the name monk was rendered still more despicable by the crowds of tramps palming themselves off as monks. Bearded, tonsured, and dressed in the religious habit, they swarmed throughout all parts of Christendom, begging, stealing, deceiving, and peddling false relics, and were often taken in crime and slain without mercy.[2] The secular priests hated the monks and the people mistrusted and despised both.[3] The intense speculative spirit of the age tended to create disbelief in the Church and to produce new sects which the Papacy tried in vain to suppress by force. The secular clergy were also in bad condition—the upper clergy wealthy, powerful, immoral, and worldly; the lower clergy characterised by sloth and incapacity. The need of reformation was generally recognised, but who would do it? "The Church had made no real effort at internal reform; it was still grasping, licentious, covetous, and a strange desire for something—they knew not exactly what—began to take possession of men's hearts and spread like an epidemic from village to village and from land to land."[4] Heresy, likewise, was making rapid strides and was propagated by sects whose austere lives and serviceable conduct were popular because in such a striking contrast to those of the monks and clergy.

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 36, 37.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 37, 38.
[3] *Ibid.*, i., 34.
[4] *Ibid.*, i., 268.

The general purpose of the begging orders, which grew out of these conditions, was (1) to reform the Church from within and not by revolution; (2) to avoid the evils and corruptions of wealth by making poverty an object of admiration and sanctification; (3) to send their members out to save the Church and the world instead of shutting them up in monasteries for the selfish purpose of saving their own souls; (4) to supervise the whole system and to keep the order in a harmonious working condition by a rigidly organised monarchial government; and (5) to set on foot a great reformatory home movement which would win the Church away from the corrupting idols back to a purer and more primitive Christianity.[1] The two prominent begging orders were both Romanic in origin and not Germanic.

The way for the begging orders was partially prepared by antecedent reformers and orders. Conspicuous among the individuals who were forerunners of St. Francis and St. Dominic was (1) St. Bernard (1091–1153) who advocated poverty and denounced the abuses of his day. (2) Arnold of Brescia (*c.* 1100–1155), a priest and follower of Abélard, assailed the Pope's temporal power, attacked the wealth of the clergy, urged the secularisation of ecclesiastical property, and led a popular revolt in Rome for a republic. He was hanged, burned, and his ashes were thrown into the Tiber.[2] (3) Gerach of Reichersberg (1093–1169), a German monk and canon of Augsburg, left his position disgusted at the irregularity of the lives of the canons, went to Rome in 1125, and was officially appointed

[1] Sabatier, 28 *ff.*

[2] *Mon. Ger.*, xx., 537; Jaffé, i., 404; Hausrath, *Arnold of Brescia;* Franke, *Arnold of Brescia;* Gregorovius, *Rome in M. A.*

by Honorius II. to reform the canonry. As the head of the canonry of Reichersberg (1132) he became an active and rigorous reformer.[1] (4) Foulques de Neuilly (died 1202), an obscure, ignorant priest, whose mighty conviction of the sins of the world and the Church made him a great preacher, was licensed by Innocent III. as a missionary. He converted thousands from wayward lives, reclaimed lost women and founded a convent for them at Paris, denounced the clergy without mercy, and struck at every evil in the Church. His reformation, however, was lost in the crusading zeal and he himself helped to preach the Fourth Crusade.[2]

Among the movements laying the foundations for the begging orders were (1) the "Poor Men," or Arnoldists, who were founded in Italy after the death of Arnold of Brescia[3]; (2) the "Poor Men of Lyons"[4]; and (3) the "Poor Catholics," who were founded by Duran de Husce, a Spaniard and disciple of St. Dominic. These "Poor Catholics" based their organisation on poverty and self-abnegation, sought to convert heretics, and were approved by Innocent III. although fought by the clergy. They appear to have been lost in the forcible effort to exterminate heresy.[5] (4) The Beghards and Beguins were founded in the Netherlands about 1180. At first companies of women were formed in the Belgian cities to care for the sick, to perform other acts of charity, and to aid the widows and orphans of the Crusaders. They lived together in a common house, led a pious life according to a few

[1] Migne, 193, 194; *Mon. Ger.*, iii., 131–525; Wattenbach, *Geschichtsquellen.* ii., 308, 520.

[2] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 244.

[3] *Ibid.*, i., 75.

[4] See Chap. XVIII.

[5] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 246.

simple rules, but took no vows. They were called Beguins. Early in the thirteenth century similar companies of men were formed and called Beghards. Members could leave the order at will, marry or enter any occupation after leaving. These orders had their own little houses, each one distinct in its organisation, which were frequently endowed by rich burghers. The inmates were also given to hand labour and did not neglect education, although their chief work was soul saving and charity. They spread rapidly from the Netherlands to Germany, to France, to Italy, and to Bohemia and Poland. As these associations increased, their members began to wander through the countries, begging and performing acts of mercy. After the middle of the thirteenth century, charges of heresy were made against them and they were persecuted by the Church.[1] (5) The Carmelites, one of the mendicant orders, according to its legendary history was founded by Elijah on Mount Carmel. The first disciples were Jonah, Micah, and Obadiah; and the wife of Obadiah was the first abbess. Even Pythagoras, Mary, and Jesus were considered members. The real origin, however, seems to lie in the fact that Phocas, a Greek monk from Patmos, in 1185 saw the ruins of a monastery on Mount Carmel and there an association of hermits was formed. The Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1209 gave the association a rule and in 1224 this rule was confirmed by Honorius III. The order played an active part during the Crusades until 1238, when it was removed to Sicily and later to England and France, where it followed the custom and became a mendicant order in 1247.

[1] Mosheim, *The Beghards and Beguins*. In 1311 Clement V. suppressed both orders.

The founder of the Dominicans, or Black Friars, was Dominic de Guzman, born in 1170 in old Castile of noble ancestry. Many miraculous tales were told about his mother and his infancy.[1] At the age of seven he was given over to his uncle, who was archpresbyter at Gumyel de Ycan. At the age of fourteen he entered the University of Palencia,[2] where he remained ten years as a "laborious, devout, abstemious" student. Theology was his chief subject and he became a distinguished theologian. While a student, it was said that he sold his clothes to feed the poor in a time of famine, and on another occasion he offered to redeem a sad woman's brother from slavery by taking his place. At the age of twenty-four (1194), after having studied ten years at the University, he became a canon of the Bishop of Osma, where he helped to introduce the rules of St. Augustine. Soon he was made sub-prior of the chapter, became very active in ecclesiastical affairs, excelled in asceticism, which was inspired no doubt by reading Cassian's famous work on monasticism, and became a zealous and eloquent missionary among the Mohammedans and Jews of the neighbourhood.

In 1203 he went with the Bishop of Osma to southern France to secure a bride for the King's son. In this diplomatic venture they were successful, but the bride died before she could go to Spain. Here it was that Dominic got his first view of the aggressive Albigensian heretics.[3] From southern France he

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, bk. ix., 250. See Drane, *Hist. of St. Dominic*, Lond., 1891, who narrates all these legends as true.

[2] Afterwards transferred to Salamanca.

[3] It is related that at Toulouse, Dominic's host was an Albigensian and that the young religious enthusiast spent the night in converting him.

accompanied the Bishop of Osma to Rome, where the bishop begged Innocent III. to permit him to go as a missionary to the Huns, or the Saracens, but the request was refused. The task of converting the heretics of southern France had been intrusted to the Cistercians, but they had utterly failed to accomplish it. As Dominic and the bishop were returning to France, they met at Montpellier three of these Cistercian abbots, who had been sent out by the Pope to superintend the duties intrusted to their order. The pomp and splendour of the abbots called forth this bold rebuke from Dominic: "It is not by the display of pomp and power, cavalcades of retainers and richly houseled palfreys, nor by gorgeous apparel, that the heretics win proselytes; it is by zealous preaching, by apostolic humility, by austerity and seeming holiness. Zeal must be met by zeal, humility by humility, false sanctity by real sanctity, preaching falsehood by preaching truth."[1] The abbots were advised to send out for the great work men who were imbued with apostolic poverty and zeal. The abbots accepted the advice and joined Dominic and his companion in their new conception of missionary work, but apparently their labours were checked in 1208 by the crusade waged against the Albigenses.

During the efforts to exterminate these revolters against the faith and authority of Rome, there are two accounts of the activity of Dominic,—first, that that he was a fiery leader of the crusading parties, and, secondly, that he strongly denounced the war. The probability seems to be that he lived quietly in his monastery at Prouille endeavouring to convert the

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, bk. ix., 242.

heretics without taking part in the war.[1] Whatever the fact may have been however, so far as the historical sources go, for the next eight years his life is a blank. No doubt he was wisely planning for the future. In 1206 the Bishop of Toulouse presented "to Dominic of Osma the church of St. Mary's of Prouille and the adjacent land to the extent of thirty feet" for the use of his women converts, who at first were nine noble ladies for whom he drew up a monastic rule. The convent soon became wealthy and influential. At the close of the war in 1214 Dominic, now forty-four years old, had made but little progress. His converts were few, his influence small, but the seeds were being sowed which would return a rich harvest. His character at this time reveals a man of earnest, resolute purpose; of deep, unalterable conviction; full of burning faith; kind of heart and ever cheerful; of winning manner and charitable beyond reason; yet given to scourgings and vigils till nature was nearly exhausted.[2]

Through the gift of Peter Cella, a rich man of Toulouse, Dominic founded in 1214 the monastery of St. Rouen near Toulouse which was the home of the Inquisition for over a hundred years. There he gathered some devout souls about him and they began to live like monks. The Bishop of Toulouse gave them one sixth of the tithes for their work. This was the beginning of the great Dominican order. The next step was to get papal sanction for the new organisation and for this purpose Dominic went with the Bishop of Toulouse to Rome. Innocent III., won through a

[1] The Inquisition was not organised until 1215. See Drane, 109; Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 300.

[2] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 250.

dream,[1] consented to sanction the order provided some known rule should be adopted. Consequently Dominic organised his monks according to the canons regular of St. Augustine, which was Dominic's own order. That rule, however, was almost immediately modified to meet the boundless plans and scope of the work which held Dominic captive. A grand master was put at the head of the order as absolute ruler and under him were provincial priors, elected during good behaviour. The friars were held to implicit obedience, as soldiers of Christ, but poverty was not at first a part of the rule. It was adopted only after the Franciscans had made it so attractive (1220). At stated times general and provincial assemblies were to be held to further the prosperity of the order.

Dominic now wisely took up his residence at Rome, where he was made court preacher, lived in the papal palace, and guided the activities of his new order. Honorius III. in 1216 sanctioned the needed changes in the rule, authorised the monks to preach and hear confessions everywhere, and took the order under his special protection.[2] Dominic's little band of sixteen followers—among whom were an Englishman, a German, and some Spaniards—were sent out into the world to begin the strenuous life of service. Laymen and ecclesiastics of all ranks hastened to join the order. When the second general assembly was held at Bologna in 1221 there were present representatives from sixty convents and eight provinces, representing Spain, France, England, Hungary, Poland, and Italy. This same year a secular organisation for both men and

[1] In the dream the Pope saw the great Roman Church about to fall had not Dominic upheld it.

[2] Conway, *Frachet's Lives of the Brethren.*

women called "The Soldiers of Jesus Christ" was organised to convert the laymen, to fight heretics, and to win unbelievers. The members had a distinct dress and special rites and services.[1] Dominic died in a monastery at Bologna in 1221 and twelve years later was canonised.

A new constitution was adopted by the Dominicans in 1228 and revised and completed in 1241 and 1252. Members of the order devoted themselves exclusively to preaching, soul saving, fighting heresy, and in educating the people in the true faith. From the schools founded by the order came most of their recruits. They were the model preachers of the Middle Ages and the keenest theologians of the day, producing such men as Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas. Among their numbers were found popes, cardinals, and famous doctors. The first Dominican to wear the papal tiara was Innocent V. in 1276, and he was succeeded by three others. The first cardinal to be chosen from their ranks was Hugh of Vienne in 1243, and he was followed by fifty-nine more. Among the famous doctors of the order were Albertus Magnus, Meister Echart, Johan Tauler, Henry Suso, Savonarola, Las Casas, and Vincent Ferrier. The Dominicans could boast of more than eight hundred bishops, one hundred and fifty archbishops, and the number of martyrs belonging to their order between 1234 and 1334 was thirteen thousand three hundred and seventy. So influential did they become and so dangerous to the prerogatives of the clergy[2] that Innocent IV. (1254), Boniface VIII.

[1] The "Soldiers of Jesus Christ" later became the "Order of Penance" and is now known as "The Third Order." There are many editions in English of the *Tertiary Daily Manual.*

[2] Moeller, ii., 412 *ff.*

(1300), and Clement VIII. (1311) were forced to curtail their privileges. In 1228 the first Dominican monk occupied a chair in the Univeristy of Paris and in 1230 another was added and from this time on they attempted to monopolise learning in the University. Scholasticism was largely the product of their minds. They were very active in missionary work and in 1245 they were sent to the Tartars by Innocent IV.; in 1249 to Persia by Louis IX.; in 1272 to China by Gregory X.; and they laboured among the Jews and Saracens in Spain, and in Poland, Denmark, Sweden, and Russia. They built monasteries and churches; and art and architecture are deeply indebted to them for many of the finest specimens produced in Europe.[1] The history of theology, philosophy, and science until the Renaissance and Reformation is little more than a petty controversial rivalry between them and the Franciscans.

The founder of the Franciscans, or Minorites, or Grey Friars, was Francis of Assisi. He was born in 1182 at Assisi of a rich mercantile family. He received a little learning from the parish priest, but manifested no love for school instruction. He knew Latin and learned some French while with his father on business in France. It was early determined that he should be educated for business. Reports concerning his early character show that he was cheerful and kind-hearted, careless and indifferent to work, vain and fond of fine clothes, prone to join comrades in dissipating carousals, and too fond of squandering his father's money in banquets for his friends.[2]

[1] Jameson, *Legends of Monastic Orders as Represented in the Fine Arts.*

[2] Sabatier, 8.

At the age of twenty Francis joined a war party against Perugia. He was taken captive and held for a year in prison and this seemed to sober him somewhat. Two serious illnesses led him to change his life and a series of visions determined his conduct (1208). He boldly and suddenly deserted his worldly companions and started out passionately on the path of self-denial. He was now twenty-six years of age. He declared that poverty should be his bride, and resolved to go to Rome to throw all his possessions on the altar of St. Peter. Upon his return journey he joined a gang of beggars and exchanged his clothes for the filthiest rags among them. Next he appropriated a quantity of his father's goods and sold them, together with the horse, to restore the church of St. Damiani. Then he hid a month in a cave and when he returned looking wild and haggard he was hooted and stoned in the streets. His father, alarmed and angered at his acts called him before the Bishop to force him to give up his patrimony. Francis stripped off all his clothing but his hair shirt and the Bishop covered him with an old cloak. Surrendering his inheritance and even his very clothing to his father he exclaimed: "Peter Bernardone was my father; I now have but one father, He that is in heaven." This was the keynote of his whole life.[1] From now henceforth he was consecrated to mendicancy, wandered about in a hermit's attire, devoted himself to the lepers, helped restore with his own hands four ruined churches, and resolved to work out his own salvation in loving service for the weak and needy—an evidence of his genuine conversion and a thing radically different from the Christianity of that period. One day in

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 387.

February, 1209, the text rang in his ears: "Provide neither gold nor silver nor brass in your purses, neither scrip for your journey, neither two coats nor shoes nor staff, for the labourer is worthy of his hire."[1] These strong words, coming from the priest who was celebrating mass in one of the little churches which Francis had helped to rebuild, pierced him like a revelation. "This is what I want," he cried; "this is what I was seeking; from this day forth I shall set myself with all my strength to put it in practice." Accordingly he threw away his wallet, staff, and shoes, and put on a rough grey tunic of coarse woollen cloth, girt by a hempen cord, and went barefooted through the land preaching repentance.[2] He lived now as a follower of the living Jesus,—"like the birds of the air,"—and his childish simplicity and radiating face made him beloved by the poor and a comfort to the troubled and sick.[3]

Francis did not have in mind at first the institution of a brotherhood; his ideal was rather the solitary ascetic preaching repentance to a world of sin, and his strange, fervoured piety soon made him famous in the neighbourhood of Assisi. Gradually kindred spirits joined him and begged to share his mission. Bernard of Quintavalle was the first to ask to be associated with him, and in order to learn God's will Francis opened the Bible at random and read Matthew xix., 21; vi., 8; xvi., 24. Others came until his disciples numbered eight. He received them and put them under vows of poverty and preaching. The time had now come to evangelise the world. These disciples were sent out in pairs to the four points of the compass, with these words:

[1] Matt. x., 7–10.
[2] Sabatier, 70.
[3] See Ogg, §63.

Go and preach two by two. Preach peace and patience; tend the wounded and relieve the distressed; reclaim the erring; bless them which persecute you and pray for them that despitefully use you. Fear not because you are small and seem foolish. Have confidence in the Lord who has vanquished the world. Some will receive you and many proud will resist you. Bear all with sweetness and patience. Soon the wise and noble will be with us. The Lord hath given me to see this—I have in my ears the sounds of the languages of all peoples who will come to us—French, Spanish, German and English. The Lord will make us a great people even to the end of the earth.

Upon their reuniting, four more were added to their number and Francis gave them a rule of which poverty was the basic principle and chastity and obedience were necessary requirements.

Papal confirmation was the next step. This Francis sought in 1210 from Innocent III. in a friendly interview at Rome.[1] The Pope in doubt submitted the question to the cardinals and it was carried in favour of Francis. His rule was approved orally and the members thus came under the spiritual authority of Rome and were authorised to receive the tonsure and to preach the word of God A second rule less severe than the first was drawn up and approved by Honorius III. in 1223, and it remained the unaltered constitution of the Franciscan order.[2] The organisation according to this rule provided for a General Minister at the head, provincial ministers, and brethren, or minorities. Applicants were required to sell all their possessions for the poor, to promise to live according to the gospel, and to take the absolute vows of chastity, obedience,

[1] Matthew of Paris, ed. by Watson, 340.

[2] Henderson, *Hist. Docs.*, 344; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 269.

and poverty. Each monk was to have two gowns of vile cloth which were to be patched as long as possible. No shoes were to be worn except when absolutely necessary. All but the sick had to walk. No money could be received save for the poor and the needy. All who were able were compelled to labour and thus earn their food and clothing. "Brethren," said Francis, "know that poverty is the special path of salvation, the inciter to humility, and the root of perfection."[1] A very simple ritual with one daily mass and but little music was instituted.

Francis sent his disciples out over the whole world to preach his gospel, while he continued the simplicity of his earlier life, living in a little hut with a ground floor, preaching to and converting whole multitudes who came to hear and to see him, and continuing his acts of mercy and love. He founded a convent of women called the "Clarisses" or "Poor Clares," who became almost as famous as the "Poor Brothers."[2] In 1221 he established the "Brothers and Sisters of Penitence," a lay order whose members, though living under a rule, retained their social position and employments, but bound themselves to abstain from all worldly dissipations like dancing, theatre-going, and secular festivals, and to live godly lives.[3] This was a very sensible arrangement because by it Francis enlisted all classes in sympathetic co-operation.[4] Impelled by missionary zeal Francis journeyed not only throughout Italy but to Illyria, Spain, and with twelve brethren even went to the distant Holy Land,

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, vol. i., 264. See his curious prayer to Christ.
[2] Read the legend of St. Clara in Butler, *Lives of Saints*.
[3] Milman, iv., 270.
[4] Maclear, *Hist. of Christ. Missions in the M. A.*, ch. 16.

where he not only converted thousands to Christianity, but even attempted to win the Sultan himself, Failing in this he returned to Italy.[1] In his relations with Rome Francis was the truest son of the Church and formed an army trained in piety and absolute obedience which the Pope used later to great advantage. For himself, however, he demanded freedom to live and to act after his own heart. His life was spared to see his order cover the world, but at length worn out by his labours and consuming zeal he died in 1226 naked and in poverty.[2] After his death it is said that the five wounds of the Saviour, called the "stigmata," were found on his body.[3] He was canonised in 1228 by Gregory IX.

Few persons in the world's history have stamped their character and influence upon their age in a more marked manner than did St. Francis. His life is hallowed by countless miracles and it is not always easy to separate myth from truth. But a careful study of his career reveals the fact that he felt the unity of the universe in God and preached it to man in love and charity as a genuine religious philosopher. With an unparalleled ardour and spiritual industry, he taught every one that the salvation of a human soul comes through self-sacrifice. He and his followers aimed to realise the simplicity of Christ and his apostles. "No human creature since Christ has more fully incarnated the ideal of Christianity than Francis."[4] His chief happiness was in ministering to the needs of

[1] Milman, iv., 267.

[2] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 270; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 392; Ogg, §64, gives the will of St. Francis.

[3] See Sabatier, 443 *ff.*, Hase, and other authorities.

[4] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 260. See Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars*, 47 *ff.*

his fellow creatures. "The perfection of gladness," he said "consists not in working miracles, in curing the sick, expelling devils, or raising the dead; nor in learning and knowledge of all things; nor in eloquence to convert the world, but in bearing all ills and injuries and injustices and despiteful treatment with patience and humility." Through his insane, extravagant asceticism there shines forth a patience, humility, and depth of love necessary to oppose the pride and cruelty of his age. He inculcated the gospel of cheerfulness and declared that gloom and sadness were the deadly weapons of Satan. He had a poetic soul, was passionately fond of animals and flowers—called them his brothers and sisters—and preached some beautiful sermons to the trees, the fish in the streams, the birds,[1] and the posies. He wrote some rugged and touching verse—"The first broken utterances of a new voice which was soon to fill the world."[2] "Of all saints St. Francis was the most blameless and gentle. Francis was emphatically the saint of the people, of a poetic people, like the Italians."[3] In many ways he was the forerunner of Dante. In prayer, in picture, and in song, the worship of St. Francis vied with that of Jesus. In story and legend he soon outstripped Christ.

It was in 1219 that St. Francis sent his disciples out to evangelise the world. Those who went to Germany and Hungary were regarded as heretics and roughly treated. In France at first they were mistaken for Cathari and an appeal was made to the Pope concerning them. Five suffered martyrdom in Morocco. They soon spread to all parts of the

[1] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 391.
[2] Read his "Song of Creation" in Mrs. Oliphant's Biography.
[3] Milman, iv., 268, 269.

world and many of them perished as martyrs in the cause they had espoused. When St. Francis held his first chapter in 1221 three thousand members[1] were present and Provincial Masters had been appointed in all European countries. In 1260 there were thirty-three provinces, one hundred eighty-two guardianships, eight thousand monasteries and two hundred thousand friars. The order has produced five Popes and many cardinals, bishops, theologians, writers, and poets.

A comparison of the two founders and their orders reveals some interesting facts. Both leaders were born about the same time, St. Dominic being the older by twelve years. Both were of Romance origin—one of noble, the other of ignoble birth. The early life of each was wholly dissimilar in disposition, education, and relation to the Church. The causes operating to make them reformers were very different. St. Dominic dreamed of an aggressive, skilfully-trained body of preachers of simple life to convert the heretics and to instruct the orthodox, thus keeping them firm. St. Francis on the other hand made poverty the first Christian grace and sought to lead all men back to Jesus as the great model. One laboured for doctrinal orthodoxy, the other for personal piety. Both applied to Innocent III. about the same time for a permit to found a new order and both were successful. Each order in its purpose was reformatory and in the monastic world revolutionary.[2] In organisation the two orders were essentially the same: each had a governor-general at Rome, provincial governors in the provinces, priors or guardians over single cloisters, which were simply "homes" and not convents in the old sense and

[1] Moeller, i., 405.
[2] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 273.

demanded a certain type of life for the members. The vows were essentially the same, although the Franciscans originated and the Dominicans adopted that of poverty. Both orders devoted themselves to preaching and to saving souls.

Education, art, morality, and religion of the later Middle Ages were in a large measure moulded by the influence of these two organisations. Both had great scholars, preachers, teachers, higher clergy, and popes.

> Whenever in the thirteenth century we find a man towering above his fellows, we are almost sure to trace him to one of the mendicant orders. Raymond of Pennaforte, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Roger Bacon, and Duns Scotus are names which show how irresistibly the men of highest gifts were glad to seek among the Dominicans or Franciscans their ideal life.[1]

The Franciscans were realists and Scottists; the Dominicans, nominalists and Thomists. The Franciscans believed in the immaculate conception; the Dominicans denied it. Both came into conflict with the secular clergy. They could not say mass, but were very popular confessors and thus tended to deprive the clergy of support and revenues and even threatened to supersede the old ecclesiastical system. Women and the pious as a rule upheld the begging orders, while the state, the soldiers, and the men took the part of the clergy. In both, the individual was compelled to remain poor, while the society became dangerously rich. The Dominicans were aristocratic; the Franciscans democratic.

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 266.

Each order borrowed something from the other: St. Francis took St. Dominic's idea of itinerant preachers; St. Dominic adopted St. Francis's plan of poverty. Both became quickly popular and both had exemptions and privileges showered upon them by Rome.[1] Their members could not be excommunicated by any bishop and were exempt from all local jurisdiction save that of their own order.[2] They had a right to live freely in excommunicated lands. Being directly responsible to the Pope alone, they were used by him to raise money, to preach crusades, to sell indulgences, to execute excommunications, to serve as spies and secret police, and to act as papal legates on all kinds of missions. In addition to practically usurping and monopolising the functions of preaching and confession and granting absolution, they were finally permitted to celebrate mass on portable altars.[3] In return for these privileges each order gave the Pope a vast army which overran Europe in his name. Both orders helped to carry on the work of the Inquisition.[4] Both laboured incessantly in the missionary field and from the thirteenth century onward they were the great missionary pioneers in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. Both had a tertiary order of laymen which went far to remove the barrier between the ecclesiastic and the people. From this comparison it will be seen that the Franciscans and Dominicans were much more alike than unlike in their origin, leaders, aims, methods, and results. After the thirteenth century both departed from their original ideals, became corrupt, worldly, and very unpopular.

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 271, 272, 273. *Cf.* No. 268.
[2] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 274.
[3] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 271, 272, 273.
[4] *Ibid.*, 299.

A third begging order was created in 1243, when Pope Innocent IV. authorised the organisation of a band of Italian monks under the rule of St. Augustine. Lanfranc Septala of Milan was made general of the order and provincial rulers were appointed for Italy, Spain, France, and Germany. Under Alexander IV. in 1256 they assumed the rights and duties of a mendicant order and in 1287 they were taken under the particular protection of the Pope. They soon spread rapidly over western Europe and by the fifteenth century covered forty-two provinces, had two thousand monasteries, and thirty thousand monks. It was this order which young Martin Luther entered in 1505 at Erfurt.

No better summary of the general results of the begging orders has ever been made than that of Lea when he says:

> The Mendicants came upon Christendom like a revelation—men who had abandoned all that was enticing in life to imitate the Apostles, to convert the sinner and unbeliever, to arouse the slumbering sense of mankind, to instruct the ignorant, to offer salvation to all; in short to do what the Church was paid so enormously in wealth and privileges and power for neglecting. Wandering on foot over the face of Europe, under burning suns or chilling blasts, rejecting alms in money but receiving thankfully whatever coarse food might be set before the wayfarer, or enduring hunger in silent resignation, taking no thought for the morrow, but busied eternally in the work of snatching souls from Satan, and lifting men up from the sordid cares of daily life, of ministering to their infirmities and of bringing to their darkened souls a glimpse of heavenly light—such was the aspect in which the earliest Dominicans and Franciscans presented themselves to the eyes of men

who had been accustomed to see in the ecclesiastic only the sensual worldling intent solely upon the indulgence of his appetites.[1]

In the busy world of the 13th century there was then no agency more active than that of the Mendicant Orders, for good and for evil. On the whole perhaps the good preponderated, for they undoubtedly aided in postponing a revolution for which the world was not yet ready. Though the self-abnegation of their earlier days was a quality too rare and perishable to be long preserved, and though they soon sank to the level of the social order around them, yet their work had not been altogether lost.[2]

The degeneration which soon crept into both orders was not allowed to increase without efforts of reformation. Within fifty years after the death of St. Francis, Bonaventura, the governor-general who succeeded him, complained that the vow of poverty had broken down, that the Franciscans were more entangled in money matters than the older orders and that vast sums were lavished on costly buildings. He declared that the friars were idle, lazy beggars given to vice and so brazen that they were feared as much as highway robbers. He said further that they made undesirable acquaintances and thus gave rise to grave scandals, and that they were too greedy of burial and legacy fees and thus encroached upon the parochial clergy. St. Francis himself had been compelled to resign his generalship on account of the abuses and offered to resume it only on condition of reformation.[3] The second general, Elias, the shrewdest politician in Italy, was removed by Pope Gregory IX. It was high time

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 266.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 304.
[3] *Ibid.*, 295.

therefore that a high-minded reformer like Bonaventura appeared, for by a series of steps the Franciscans changed from a body of pietists to a band of the boldest swindlers. As preaching and soul-saving died out, the begging propensities were developed. As early as 1233 Gregory IX. told the Dominicans that their poverty should be genuine and not hypocritical.[1] The wide use of the friars by the Pope for political purposes still further diverted them from their spiritual functions and tended to make them worldly.

As a result the Franciscans soon broke into two parties: (1) The liberals who were not averse to dropping the vow of poverty and imitating the older monastic orders were very strong. (2) The reform party who desired to adhere rigidly to the preaching and practice of St. Francis were probably a minority and were weakened by subdivisions. One faction of the strict party was called Spirituales,[2] and in turn was represented by the Cæsarins who revolted against the public activity of Elias and were punished as rebels; the Celestines who were permitted to exist as a separate order by Pope Celestine V. in 1294, and were later denounced as heretics; the congregation of Narbonne which was formed in 1282; the Clarenins who were accused of heresy in 1318; and the congregation of Philip of Nyarca which was formed in 1308. A second reform element within the rigid party were the Fratricelli, authorised by Celestine V., who became revolutionists, repudiated the Papacy, left the Church, joined the Beghards, thought that they were possessed with the Holy Spirit and were exempt from sin, and

[1] See letter of Innocent III., about monastic simony in 1211. Thatcher and McNeal, No. 267.

[2] Muzzy, *The Spiritual Franciscans.*

repudiated the sacraments of the Church. They were condemned as heretics and the Inquisition was turned against them in Italy, Sicily, and southern France, but they lasted until the Reformation. Later reform factions among the Franciscans were the Capuchins (1526), Minims (1453), Observants (1415), and Recollects. These internal reformers failed to change the order because the rule of St. Francis was utterly incompatible with social life in any form.

For three centuries the Franciscans and Dominicans practically ruled the Church and state. They filled the highest civil ecclesiastical positions; they taught authoritatively in the universities and churches; they maintained the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs against kings, bishops, and heretics; and they were to the Church before the Reformation what the Jesuits were after the Reformation. The Mendicants increased so rapidly however that they soon became a burden to the Church and the people. Hence in 1272 Gregory X. in the Council of Lyons suppressed the "extravagant multitude" by reducing them to four orders: the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Augustinians.

SOURCES.

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Gerard de Frachet, *Lives of the Brethren.*
2.—Eales, S. J., *Letters of St. Bernard.* Lond., 1888.
3.—Bonaventura, *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* Lond., 1868.
4.—Brewer and Howlett, *Monumenta Franciscana.*
5.—Eccleston, *Arrival of the Friars in England.* Ed. by Brewer and Howlett in *Pub. Rolls Ser.*, 1882.

6.—*Legend of St. Francis by the Three Companions.* Tr. by E. G. Salter. Lond., 1902.
7.—Brother Leo of Assisi, *S. Francis of Assisi, Mirror of Perfection.* Tr. by S. Evans. Lond., 1898.
8.—*The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by T. W. Arnold. Lond., 1898. Several other translations.
9.—*Legends of St. Francis.* Cath. Penny Lib. Lond., 1901.
10.—*Manual of the Third Order of St. Francis.*
11.—*Third Order.* Tr. by J. G. Adderley and C. L. Marson. Lond., 1902.
12.—Parenti, P., *Commercium or My Lady's Poverty.* Tr. by Carmichael.
13.—The Franciscan Fathers, *Spirit of St. Francis of Assisi, or Maxims for Every Day in the Year.* Dub., 1888.
14.—*Works of the Seraphic Father, St. Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by a Religious of the Order. Lond., 1890.
15.—Brother Leo of Assisi, *The Mirror of Perfection.* Tr. by Countess De La Warr. Lond., 1902.
16.—Robinson, *Readings in European History*, i., 387, 391, 392.
16.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source-Book for Mediæval History*, 498, 504, 508.
17.—Ogg, A. F., *The Source-Book of Mediæval Europe.* N. Y., 1908.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—DOMINICAN:

1.—Alemany, T., *Life of St. Dominic with a Sketch of the Dominican Order.* N. Y., 1887.
2.—Drane, A. T., *The Spirit of the Dominican Order.* Lond., 1896.
The History of St. Dominic. Lond., 1891.
The Life of St. Dominic. Lond., 1891.
3.—Guirand, J., *Saint Dominic.* Tr. by Kath. de Mattos. Lond., 1901.
4.—Herkless, J., *Francis and Dominic and the Mendicant Orders.* Lond., 1901.

5.—Fletcher, W. D. G., *The Black Friars of Oxford.* Oxf., 1882.
6.—Lacordaire, H. D., *Life of Saint Dominic.* Lond., 1883.
7.—*Short Lives of Dominican Saints.* Lond., 1901.

II.—FRANCISCANS:

1.—Adderly, J., *Francis, the Little Poor Man of Assisi.* Lond., 1600. Has Rule of St. Francis.
2.—Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints.*
3.—De Chérancé, F. L., *Saint Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by R. F. O'Connor. Lond., 1880.
4.—Cotton, A. L., *A Sketch of the Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* Lond., 1885.
5.—Douglass, Cap., *Brother Francis, or Less than the Least.* Lond., 1901.
6.—Faber, F. W., *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* 2 vols. Lond., 1853–4.
7.—Lear, H. L. S., *Life of Francis of Assisi.* N. Y., 1888.
8.—Leon, Father, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis.* 5 vols. Taunton, 1885–8.
9.—*The Life of Saint Francis of Assisi; and a Sketch of the Franciscan Order*, by a Religious of the Order. N. Y., 1867.
10.—Little, W. J. K., *St. Francis of Assisi, his Times, Life and Work.* Lond., 1897.
11.—Luther, M., *Preface to a Book of Selections from the Legends of St. Francis.* Brighton, 1845.
12.—Le Monnier, Abbe Leon, *History of St. Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by a Franciscan Tertiary. Lond., 1894.
13.—Muzzy, D. S., *The Spiritual Franciscans.* Wash., 1907.
14.—Oesterley, W. O. E., *St. Francis of Assisi.* Lond., 1901.
15.—Oliphant, Mrs. M. O., *Francis of Assisi.* Lond., 1870.
16.—Sabatier, P., *Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by Louise S. Houghton. N. Y., 1894.

17.—Westlake, N. H. J., *On the Authentic Portraiture of S. Francis of Assisi.* Lond., 1897.
18.—Vernet, Abbe Felix, *The Inner Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* Tr. by Father Stanislaus. Lond., 1900.

III.—MISCELLANEOUS:
1.—Browne, E. G. K., *Monastic Legends.* Lond.
2.—Brown, J. B., *Stoics and Saints.* Glasg., 1893.
3.—Butler, *Lives of the Saints.*
4.—Day, S. P., *Monastic Institutions.* Lond., 1865.
5.—Fosbroke, T. D., *British Monachism.*
6.—Fox, S., *Monks and Monasticism.* Lond., 1848.
7.—Gasquet, F. A., *Notes on Mediæval Monastic Libraries.* Yevil, 1891. *Sketches of Mediæval Monastic Life.* Yevil, 1891.
8.—Griffin, *Grandmont; Stories of an Old Monastery.* N. Y., 1895.
9.—Harnack, A., *Monasticism: Its Ideals and Its History.* Lond., 1901.
10.—Hill, O. T., *English Monasticism.* Lond., 1867.
11.—Jameson, Mrs. A., *Legends of the Monastic Orders.* Lond., 1880.
12.—Jessopp, A., *The Coming of the Friars.* N. Y., 1889.
13.—Lea, H. C., *History of the Inquisition.* 3 vols. *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy.* Phil., 1884. 3d ed. 2 vols. N. Y., 1907.
14.—Maclear, *History of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages.*
15.—Montalembert, Count de, *Monks of the West.* 7 vols. Lond., 1861–7.
16.—Wishart, A. D., *Short History of Monks and Monasticism.* N. Y., 1900.

IV.—GENERAL:
Alzog. ii., 507–522. Adams, *Med. Civ.*, 401. Cutts. Darras, ii., 121 *ff.*; iii., 337 *ff.* Döllinger, ch. 23–24. Fisher, pd., 6, ch. 6. Fitzgerald, ii., 54–106. Foulkes, 398. Gieseler, §67–72. Gilmartin, i., ch. 45; ii., ch. 9–10, 11–13, 14. Hase, sec. 204–211. Hore, ch.

14. Hurst, i., 805 *ff.* Jennings, ii., ch. 12–13. Kurtz, ii., 64–67. Milman, v., bk. 9, ch. 9–10. Moeller, ii., 404 *ff.* Neander, pd. 5, sec. 2, pt. 5, 268 *ff.* Robertson, bk. 5, ch. 7, 13. Tout, ch. 9, 18. Workman, ch. 7–8.

CHAPTER XXII

INNOCENT III. AND THE CHURCH AT ITS HEIGHT

OUTLINE

I.—Antecedent preparation for this period. II.—Career of Innocent III. up to 1198. III.—Innocent III.'s plans and ideals as Pope. IV.—Condition of Europe at the close of the twelfth century. V.—Innocent III. makes himself the political head of Europe. VI.—Innocent III.'s efforts to root out heresy and reform the Church. VII.—Innocent III.'s character and the general results of his pontificate. VIII.—Sources.

MANY antecedent forces prepared the way for the ascendency of the Church under the greatest of all the Popes, Innocent III. The promulgation of the Petrine theory and its development for many centuries afforded the fundamental groundwork upon which the Church at its height was built. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals furnished the constitutional basis for the work of this master Pope and their most complete realisation culminated under his rule. The Hildebrandine reformation, inspired by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, was largely attained under Innocent III. The reorganisation of the College of Cardinals tended to purify papal elections. The administrative reforms of Hildebrand restored order in the Church and subjected the councils and clergy to the Pope. The moral reforms attempted sought: (1) to enforce clerical celibacy and, although a failure immediately, ultimately were successful; (2) to abolish

simony—a task that was left for the great Innocent; (3) and to annihilate lay investiture which was partly successful in the Concordat of Worms formed in 1122. Gregory VII. had sought also, to subject the state to the Church. Some of his successors, notably Urban II., Pascal II., Calixtus II., and Alexander III.,[1] strove valiantly to realize this same purpose. The complete realisation of all these hopes, however, was left for Innocent III.

Innocent III. was born in 1160 at Anagni and bore the name Lothario. He was the fourth son of a rich noble Italian family named Conti.[2] His father was Count Trasimundo of Segni and his mother belonged to the noble Roman Scotti family which had given the Church nine Popes and thirteen cardinals. It is not unreasonable to believe, therefore, that the young Lothario inherited from his ancestors both a capacity and a desire for an important position in the Church. His education was the best obtainable at that day and was begun under the direction of two cardinal uncles. He was sent to Rome to one of the schools attached to all the churches and there received his elementary education and likewise his preparation for the university. When properly qualified he entered the University of Paris where he studied philosophy and theology under the celebrated Peter of Corbeil. While there he probably visited England in order to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of Thomas à Becket. From Paris he was sent to Bologna University where he studied civil law and especially canon law, then a very popular subject. He mastered the whole system of

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 105; Henderson, 420.

[2] Barry, *The Papal Monarchy*, 287, calls him "a Roman with Northern blood in his veins."

decretal lore and made it his guide for the rest of his life. In 1181 he returned to Rome, a university graduate, only twenty-one years of age, yet celebrated for his theological and legal erudition.

Everything pointed him toward a career in the Church—his character, his birth as the youngest son of a noble, his family connections with the Church, his education, and his natural inclination. It is no surprise, consequently, to learn that upon his return to the Eternal City he was made a canon of St. Peter's (1181). Gregory VIII. (1187), promoted him to the office of subdeacon and Clement III. (1190), his maternal uncle, made him cardinal-deacon. He now became the chief papal adviser, was a recognised leader in the College of Cardinals, though only twenty-nine years of age, and was generally known as a second Hildebrand. Upon the election of Pope Celestine III. (1191–1198), the leader of a rival party, the young churchman deserted practical church work and church politics to devote himself to study and literary work. He wrote several books of importance which reveal his deep and extensive culture, his ascetic spirit resembling that of Hildebrand and Luther, his lofty ideals of the Papacy, and his mediæval theology.[1]

Celestine III. died January 8, 1198, urging the cardinals to elect his nephew John, Cardinal of St. Paul's, as his successor. But the sacred college at once unanimously elected Cardinal Lothario, the youngest of their number, only thirty-seven, as Pope and saluted him as Innocent III. His ability and life had marked

[1] He wrote: *De contemptu mundi, sivi de miseria humanæ conditionis* (Migni, vol. 217. Part tr. in Greenwood, v., 349); *Mysteriorum Evangelicæ Legis et Sacramenti Eucharistæ; De Quadrioartita Specia Nuptiorum* (lost).

him out for several years as the next occupant of St. Peter's See. Being only in deacon's orders he was first advanced to the priesthood (Feb. 21) then consecrated bishop and crowned Pope with an elaborate ceremony of installation (Feb. 22).[1]

Innocent III. came to the papal chair with a belief in man's utter depravity and in the Pope's power to pardon all sin and to remit all penances. After his election, but before coronation, he declared:

> As God . . . hath set in . . . the heavens two great lights, the greater to rule the day, the lesser to rule the night, so also hath He set up in His Church . . . two great powers: the greater to rule the day, that is the souls; the lesser to rule the night, that is the bodies of men. These powers are the pontifical and royal: but the moon, as being the lesser body, borroweth all her light from the sun both in the quantity and quality of the light she sends forth, as also in her position and functions in the heavens. . . . The royal power borrows all its dignity and splendour from the pontifical.[2]

Again

> the Lord hath fashioned His Church after the model of the human body placing the Roman Church at the head, thereby subjecting, in obedience to himself and her, all churches as members of the one body . . . but the Church without the Pope were a body without a head.[3]

His whole policy was summed up in a remarkable consecration sermon from Luke 12:42:

> Who is this steward? It is he to whom the Lord Omnipotent said, Thou are Peter, etc. This foundation cannot be

[1] Hurter, vol. i., 89–90; Greenwood, vol. v., 371.
[2] *Gesta Inn. III.*, sec., ii., p. 3, 4.
[3] *Ep. Inn. III.*, lib. i., ep. 117, 335.

shaken . . . for Christ himself is on board; . . . Christ is the rock upon which the Holy See is founded; . . . this chair is not established by man but by God alone. . . . Therefore I fear not, for I am that steward whom the Lord hath placed over His household to give them their meat in due season. . . . Therefore my desire is to serve, not to rule. . . . As the Lord's steward . . . I must be established in the faith. . . . But faith without works is dead. My works, therefore, must be wise as well as faithful. . . . The high-priest of the Old Testament was the type and pattern of the Pope. . . . I am he whom the Lord hath placed over His household; yet who am I that I should sit on high above kings and above all princes? For of me it is written in the prophets (Jer. 1 : 10): This steward is the viceroy of God, the successor of Peter; he that standeth in the midst between God and man. He is the judge of all, but is judged by no one . . . Now His Household is the whole church and this household is one . . . out of which, if anyone remain, he and all his shall surely perish in the flood.

The germs of these ideas were found in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. They were formulated by Hildebrand and it now became the passionate purpose of Innocent III. to realise them in their entirety. To that end he adopted Hildebrand's reform program to abolish abuses and corruptions of all sorts, to enforce celibacy, to subject the clergy to the head of the Church, and to make the Church supreme above the state.

The situation in Europe at the close of the twelfth century was such as to aid Innocent in his great plans. The Crusades, now in progress for a century, had aroused a terrific religious enthusiasm, enriched the Church, increased the Pope's power, weakened rival secular authority, and paved the way for the successful

realisation of Hildebrand's ideals by Innocent III. The Papacy was well established. Its dogmas were expressed in canon law, its machinery was completed, and its right to exist as a state resting upon a territorial basis was recognised. In the Empire Henry VI. had died in 1197, Naples was ruled by a child, the Guelphs and Ghibellines were at war in the Lombard cities and the whole Empire was distracted and almost reduced to anarchy by the rival claimants to the imperial throne. In France Philip Augustus, a tyrannical ruler, ambitious to overthrow the English king, greedy to swallow up the larger fiefs, was on the throne. He had divorced his Danish wife and had remarried. At this time he was violently opposed by both the nobles and the people. In Spain the lack of a strong central power led to quarrelling among the rival kings and compelled the Pope to interfere. In England the brutal, boisterous, immoral Richard I. died in 1199 and was succeeded by the tyrannical and feeble King John who was at war with his own nobles. In the East the Slavic nations were ready to accept Roman rule while the Eastern Empire was tottering and ready to fall. In general parties in all countries were crying out to the Pope for assistance. All Europe was ripe for just such a man as Innocent III. with just such a policy.

The first step in Innocent's plan was to make himself the political head of Europe. In Italy he first made himself absolute sovereign of Rome by removing all vestiges of imperial rule. The senators and the prefect, who held their commissions from the Emperor, were required to take oaths to him as their sovereign.[1]

[1] *Gesta*, sec. 8; Ep. i., 23, 577; Hurter, i. 125; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 123.

The imperial judges were also replaced by his own appointees. By persuasion or tactful diplomacy he gained a mastery over the warring Roman nobles. From Rome he gradually extended his sway over the rest of Italy. He was made regent of Frederick II., the youthful son of Henry VI.,[1] now King of Sicily. He forced the Tuscan cities to recognise his suzerainty[2] instead of that of the German Emperor, and subdued the March of Ancona and the Duchy of Spoleto.[3] He posed as the champion of Italian independence and liberty against foreign rule. His leadership was generally recognised and he was called "The Father of His Country." "Innocent III. was the first Pope who claimed and exercised the rights of an Italian Prince."[4] When Emperor Otto IV., ceded all the lands claimed by the Papacy under grants from former rulers, an indisputable title to the papal states was established.

In Germany, before the imperial throne was made vacant by the death of Henry VI. (1197), the princes had been persuaded to choose his infant son, Frederick, King of the Romans. But the election had been set aside, and now the imperial crown was claimed by two rival claimants: Otto of Brunswick and Philip of Hohenstaufen, a brother of Henry VI. The civil war which ensued in Germany between these rival claimants gave Innocent III. his opportunity. Both claimants appealed to the Pope, but Otto was the more submissive. The Pope assumed the function of arbiter and issued a famous bull favouring Otto.[5]

[1] Greenwood, v., 376; Ep., i., 410. A papal bull declaring Sicily a papal fief was accepted without opposition.

[2] *Gesta*, sec. ii.

[3] *Ibid.*, sec. 9, 10.

[4] Creighton, i., p. 21.

[5] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 130.

Otto promised on oath protection of the possessions and rights of the Roman Church, and obedience and homage such as pious Emperors had formerly shown towards the Chair of Peter (1201). Still victory did not come to Otto and the Pope, until after ten years of civil strife followed by the assassination of Philip. In 1208 Otto was coronated by Innocent in St. Peter's, Rome, but was soon caught in deeds of treachery to the Pope and excommunicated and deposed (1210), and died forgotten seven years later.

Frederick of Sicily was anxious to become King of Germany and also Emperor. The Hohenstaufen party in Germany invited him to visit them and in this Frederick was encouraged by Innocent III. Frederick made some important concessions to the Holy See[1] (1213), was victorious in Germany, and was crowned Emperor at Aachen after the Lateran Council in 1215. After a most remarkable career he died, however, a rebel against the Church (1250). When death smote down Innocent III., he had created two Emperors, he was recognised as lord paramount over the Empire, and he ruled personally over a larger domain in the Empire than any preceding Pope.

In France Philip Augustus had been excommunicated by Pope Celestine III. (1196) for having divorced his wife, a Danish Princess in order to marry, with the sanction of the French clergy, Mary, the daughter of the Duke of Bohemia. Immediately after his election and before his coronation, Innocent III. took up this case. He ordered Philip to put away his concubine and to take back his lawful wife under the threat of pronouncing his children bastards and of putting his

[1] *Mon. Ger.*, ii., 224; Greenwood, v., 510; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 135, 136.

land under an interdict. Since the king turned a deaf ear to these demands, the Pope excommunicated him, declared France under an interdict,[1] and punished the French bishops. As a result Philip was compelled to submit, and agreed to take back his wife and to restore confiscated Church lands. This was a great and significant victory for the Pope.

In Spain the King of Leon had married a cousin contrary to canon law. The Pope immediately annulled the marriage. The king refused at first to give up his wife, but was forced to submission by excommunication.[2] The Kings of Navarre and Castile were compelled to make peace and to unite against the Saracens. Portugal was declared a fief of the Holy See and the king was commanded to hurry up the payment of tribute.[3] The King of Aragon was crowned by the Pope at Rome as a feudal vassal.[4]

In England King John, who had succeeded Richard I. in 1199, had embittered against him nobles, clergy, and common people by extortions and tyrannical acts of all sorts. He aroused the wrath of Innocent III. by making a treaty of peace with Philip Augustus of France, while that ruler was still under the ban for repudiating his first wife and marrying another. John had likewise boldly ousted the Bishop of Limoges, confiscated his lands, and revived the Constitutions of Clarendon.[5] Innocent III. immediately called John to account for these misdemeanours[6] and forced the stubborn king to promise to make a crusade to atone

[1] Ogg, §66.
[2] *Gesta*, sec. 58.
[3] Ep. i., 99, 249, 446.
[4] Greenwood, v., 456; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 118.
[5] Henderson, 11.
[6] Lee, *Source-Book of Eng. Hist.*, sec. 66.

for his sins. The Pope demanded the immediate reinstatement of the Bishop of Limouges in his office and lands.[1] He treated the Constitutions of Clarendon as if they had been repealed and waited for his opportunity to humble the haughty English ruler.

In 1205 (July 13), Hubert the Archbishop of Canterbury died. That same night the monks of the Cathedral elected their sub-prior as archbishop and hurried him off to Rome for papal confirmation. King John, backed by the suffragan bishops of the diocese, appointed and invested the Bishop of Norwich as archbishop and he also started for Rome to get the papal sanction. Here was the opportunity for which Innocent III. was looking. Both elections were declared void and the fifteen monks of Canterbury were brought to Rome where they were forced to choose Cardinal Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury.[2] The Pope consecrated Langton to the new office and demanded King John's approval. John's rage was unbounded. He impeached the monks for treason and expelled them from England on pain of death. He confiscated the property of the see and the chapter of Canterbury and told the Pope bluntly that he would never permit the illegally elected stranger to set foot on English soil. The Pope first threatened the king with an interdict, which merely produced angry and obstinate counter threats from John, and then in 1208 actually published the interdict.[3] The king retaliated by seizing Church property, abusing the clergy, exil-

[1] Ep. v., 66.

[2] See Roger of Wendover's *Chronicle*, for facts about life of Langton, and Hook, *Lives of Archbishops of Cant.*, ii., 657.

[3] *Cf.* Roger of Wendover, *Chronicle*, tr. by Giles. Lee *Source-Book*, sec. 67; Colby, No. 29.

ing the bishops, and confiscating the estates of their relatives.

Determined to humble the stubborn monarch, Innocent III. in 1210 formally excommunicated John and deposed him from the kingship.[1] The English crown was given to Philip II. of France who at once prepared an army to invade England. At the same time John's followers deserted him and in this desolation he was compelled to accept humiliating terms of unconditional surrender.[2] He agreed to reinstate all prelates to office and property; to pay a full indemnity to all laity and clergy, eight thousand pounds being paid down as a guarantee; to make the Pope arbiter about all sums of restitution; to give the Pope all right to Church patronage in England; to reverse all outlawries; and to surrender his crown and kingdoms of England and Ireland to the Pope and then to receive them back as the sworn vassal of Rome, paying therefor the annual sum of one thousand marks of silver.[3]

When the English barons wrested from the stubborn king the great Magna Charta in 1215,[4] Pope Innocent III. championed the cause of the king, his vassal, against the barons. He called a council, annulled the Magna Charta, issued a manifesto against the barons, and ordered the bishops to excommunicate them.[5] He suspended Archbishop Langton from office for siding with the barons against the king and directly appointed

[1] Lee, *Source-Book*, sec. 68, 69.

[2] *Ibid.*, sec. 71.

[3] Greenwood, v., 587; Ep., xvi., 77; Lee, *Source Book*, sec. 72, 73, 74. Gee and Hardy, No. xxv.

[4] Roger of Wendover, *Chronicle*, tr. by Giles, ii., 304. Lee, *Source-Books*.

[5] Rymer, i., 135; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 129.

the Archbishop of York. At the same time Prince Louis of France, who had invaded England with an army, was summarily excommunicated for having entered a domain of the Holy See. As a result of the Pope's policy King John of England became a suppliant vassal of Rome, the English clergy were subjected to the Pope, the resources of England were put at the Pope's command, the nobles and the people were thwarted in their efforts to check John in his tyranny, and Magna Charta was declared illegal though not invalidated.

In the East the Latin rulers in Palestine and at Constantinople were papal vassals. The Pope asserted his supremacy over the Eastern Empire in refusing to restore the Isle of Cyprus and in demanding a council to heal the schism.[1] Leo, King of Armenia, threw both his church and his kingdom into the Pope's arms for protection.[2] Bulgaria was won away from the Greek Church and her king was given a crown independent of the Eastern Empire.[3] Hungary was treated as a vassal kingdom and papal protection was extended to her king.

In the North the King of Norway had been slain by a priest who then compelled the bishops in 1184 to crown him king. Innocent III. took up the case and appointed the King of Denmark and the Archbishop of Norway a court to try the murderer on the charge of having forged papal bulls to favour his coronation. His supporters were excommunicated, he himself was put under the ban, and all places giving him shelter were interdicted. Even the Bishop of Ireland was

[1] *Gesta*, par. 60, 61; *Ep.*, i., 353, 354.
[2] *Ibid.*, 109, 110.
[3] *Ibid.*, 68, 70.

rebuked for having permitted his clergy to communicate with the "accursed apostate." The Pope reorganised the northern churches and tied the clergy to St. Peter's Chair. In Poland the archbishop was censured for neglecting to draw the spiritual sword in favour of Duke Bolesas who had been ill treated by his subjects. The Duke of Holland, a faithful vassal, was in turn assisted against his rebellious subjects.

No occupant of St. Peter's Chair was more sincerely impressed with the beauty and necessity of rescuing the Holy Land from the infidels than Innocent III. He sent preachers all over Europe to stir up a holy war. He laboured incessantly to pacify and unite all rulers under his guidance in this great enterprise. He attempted to eliminate the mercenary character of the crusade by forbidding the Venetians to traffic with the Mohammedans.[1] But he strove in vain to prevent the secular diversions and consequent failure of the Fourth Crusade. When the crusaders in fulfilment of their bargin with the Venetians,[2] left Venice to attack Zara, a Christian city, he threatened them with excommunication. After the deed was done, however, he granted conditional pardon.[3] The capture of Constantinople was likewise censured but in the end lauded,[4] although he strongly urged the crusaders to fulfil their original vow.[5] So skillfully did he manipulate affairs that both Greek and Latin Emperors recognised his overlordship, the Greek Church was

[1] Thatcher and McNeal, No. 286.

[2] *Transl. and Reprints*, iii., No. 1, p. 2–8.

[3] *Gesta*, sec. 83, 85, 87.

[4] *Ibid.*, sec. 89; *Epp.*, vii., 164; *Transl. and Reprints*, iii., No. 1, p. 20.

[5] *Gesta*, sec. 93.

subjected to Rome, and the appointment of the Patriarch of Constantinople was in his hands.

Since this phase of the fourth crusade fell so far short of its original aim, Innocent summoned the Lateran Council in 1215 to proclaim an ideal crusade for June 1, 1216.[1] The Pope intended to direct the movement in person or by legates. The usual privileges were granted to crusaders and a variety of financial regulations were published authorising the clergy to sell or mortgage Church lands for three years in order to raise necessary funds; urging kings, nobles, cities, and rural districts to contribute money and men, and levying a tax on the cardinals and the head of the Church. In addition the Pope contributed out of his private possessions thirty-three thousand pounds of silver and a large ship. A truce for four years was enjoined on all Christian princes on pain of excommunication and interdict. Through the untimely death of the Pope, however, while he was going to persuade Pisa to join in the crusade, the crusade did not mature, but later the Popes were not slow in claiming the leadership granted in this instance by the council to Innocent III.

In no direction did Innocent III. accomplish more than in his uncompromising attack on heresy. It must never be forgotten that heresy was the greatest crime of the Middle Ages. God had planted His Church on earth, appointed the Pope as vice-gerent, and prescribed laws and dogmas in the Bible and the canons to govern the Church. Any violation of these laws, or disbelief in the dogmas, was heresy. Consequently, heresy was treason against both the

[1] *Gesta*, sec. 98; Thatcher and McNeal, No. 288; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 338.

Church and God. A heretic was like a man with a dangerous, infectious disease. Not only was he himself in mortal danger, but he might inoculate the whole community and carry it too, down to perdition. It was the duty of the Church, therefore, to get rid of that diseased person either by curing him through recantation, or ending his power for evil by death.

The existence of heresy parallels the whole history of the Church and suggests a universal mental attribute. The causes for the remarkable growth of heresy are to be found in the departure of the Church from its earlier teachings and practices, in the failure of the Church to make its theory and practice harmonise,[1] in the remnants of earlier doctrines and heresies, and in the mental awakening of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries[2] due to the crusades and other influences.[3] Among the leading heretics of this period were:

1. Tanchelm, who carried on a heretical movement in Flanders (1108–1126), teaching the historical origin of the hierarchy, the pollution of the Eucharist in the hands of a bad priest, the illegality of tithes and the congregational view of church government.[4]

2. Eon de l'Etoile in Brittany who declared that he was the son of God sent to reform the Church (1145–1148).[5]

3. Pierre de Bruys who preached in Vallonise until he was burned (1106–1126), declaring infant baptism useless, offerings, prayers, and masses for the dead of no avail since each one would be judged by his own merits,

[1] *Ep.*, i., 494.

[2] See Munro, "The Ren. of the Twelfth Cent.," in *An. Rep. of Am. Hist. Assoc.*, 1906, i., 45.

[3] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., ch. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*, i., 64.

[5] *Ibid.*, 66.

churches unnecessary, the use of the cross idolatry, the Eucharist a mere historical incident and the Papacy with its hierarchy of officials a blatant fraud.[1]

4. Henry of Lausanne who deserted his monastery and became a reformer in various districts in France (1116–1147). He rejected the invocation of saints, taught ascetism, denounced the vice of the clergy, discarded the Eucharist, denied the sanctity of the priesthood, declared tithes to be illegal, opposed attendance at Church, and aroused an intense zeal for purity and piety. Whole congregations left their churches and joined him. At last the Church secured his arrest and condemnation to imprisonment for life, but he appears to have died shortly after.[2]

5. Arnold of Brescia, a pupil of Abelard, who travelled in various parts of Italy, France, and Germany, denouncing infant baptism, rejecting the Eucharist, assailing the wealth of the Church, lashing the vices of the clergy, and organising associations of "Poor Men" until he was finally hanged, then burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tiber.[3]

6. Peter Waldo of Lyons, a rich but ignorant merchant, who from a study of the New Testament was led, after providing for his family, to give all his possessions to the poor.[4] He became an ardent preacher, won converts, and sent them out as proselyting missionaries. He and his followers refused obedience to Pope and prelates saying all good men were priests, permitted women to preach, declared God and not man should be obeyed, rejected masses and prayers for the

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, vol. i., 68.
[2] *Ibid.*, 69.
[3] *Ibid.*, 72.
[4] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 380.

dead as useless, denied purgatory, assailed indulgences, advocated non-resistance, denounced war and homicide, attacked all the vices of the day, and organised "The Poor Men of Lyons" which order soon spread under the name Waldenses all over Europe.[1]

7. The Catharists who appeared during the Middle Ages in Lombardy in the eleventh century and soon spread over western Europe and became very powerful. They were dualists believing in God and Satan, the spiritual and the physical, the good and the bad. They held that Christ came to overthrow Satan and that the Roman Church was the latter's seat. They rejected the authority and doctrines of the Church and had a distinct ritual of their own. Soon they broke up into different sects with different names and were known in southern France as Albigenses.[2]

Innocent III.'s theory of the Papacy clearly indicated his duty about heresy and the co-operation which he might demand of the secular powers.[3] In the first year of his pontificate (1198) heretics were offered the choice of recantation or death.[4] The clergy were likewise ordered to mend their ways in order to remove the cause of heresy.[5] Two Inquisitors-General were sent to Spain and France where the clergy were directed to give them information about heresy, and the rulers and laity were asked to help the "Persecution."[6] As a result a number of heretics were put to death in Spain, southern France, and Italy. The following year (1199) the Pope appointed an additional Inquisitor-

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 76.
[2] *Ibid.*, 89; Robinson, *Readings*, i., 381.
[3] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 385.
[4] *Ep.*, i., 94.
[5] *Ibid.*, 79, 80.
[6] *Ibid.*, 94.

General for Italy and added a third for France and Spain. They were all kept very busy.

In 1207 Innocent in person led a force against the heretics at Viterbo in Italy. The heretics fled but their houses were torn down, their property confiscated, and a search made for suspects. An edict was also passed decreeing that heretics should be treated as outcasts, that they should be seized and given up to secular rulers, that their property should be confiscated, that their hiding places should be razed to the ground, that their protectors or sympathisers should forfeit one fourth of their property and be outlawed, and that rulers refusing to execute the decree should be excommunicated.[1] The same year a similar edict was issued against the heretics in southern France. To all who executed the decree were offered indulgences like those given devout visitors to the shrines of the Apostles Peter and James. On the other hand those who aided heretics were to suffer the same punishment.[2]

Innocent appointed a fourth Inquisitor-General and sent him to the French King to urge him to help exterminate the heretics. The powers of the Inquisitors at the same time were enlarged. The Pope now decreed a general war against "the enemies of God and man." The King of France was called upon to draw the sword, while the nobles and people were summoned to the new crusade with promises of the same indulgences as given to those who went as soldiers to Palestine.[3] Count Raymond of Toulouse was harshly excommunicated and deposed. This new holy

[1] *Ep.* vol. ii., 335.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 94.
[3] *Ibid.*, x., 149.

war with Simon de Monfort as leader, was preached amidst much enthusiasm. A bloody war of extermination was carried on for some years in southern France until the Albigenses were all but extinct. As a result, the Pope's authority was greatly increased, Simon de Montfort was made Count of Toulouse, while Raymond was exiled to England, the precedent for using the crusading machinery against heretical regions was established, and the Inquisition was founded. The Lateran Council in 1215 defined heresy and formulated complete regulations for its suppression.[1]

Not only was Innocent III. a great defender of Church dogmas, a master-organiser of the hierarchy, and an administrator without a peer in Church history, but he was also a far-reaching and sincerely intelligent reformer. The judicial reforms were necessary to round out Innocent's theory of Church government. He claimed immediate, personal jurisdiction over all "*causæ majores*," such as disputes of the clergy, and all questions involving the interests of the Church or of churchmen. Consequently, the power of secular rulers over the clergy was curtailed. An appalling number of cases was sent for settlement to the curia at Rome and cases there were decided with a speed and punctuality hitherto unknown. Innocent III. personally "held court" three days each week, heard all important cases and rendered the decisions.[2] On the other hand unimportant cases were turned over to committees under his eye. He insisted upon having honest judges all over Christendom for minor cases and enforced his will by making an appeal to Rome simple, easy, and inexpensive.[3] All bribes and gifts to

[1] Greenwood, v., 641, 644. Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 314, 320.
[2] *Gesta*, sec. 41, 42.
[3] *Ep.*, i., 335, 349, 399.

judges were strictly prohibited. The Lateran Council of 1215 modified the trial of clerical offenders by insisting upon trial in the presence of the accused, a clear statement of the charges, a list of witnesses for the accused, and no appeal before the rendering of a decision in an inferior court.[1] Innocent III. also took all treaties between nations under the protection of the Church,[2] and insisted on acting as supreme arbiter in all wars and civil feuds.[3]

The necessity of moral reformation was recognised by Innocent III. from the beginning of his pontificate. From the year of his election he endeavoured to abolish all those debilitating corruptions which prevented the realisation of his ideal priesthood; namely, pluralism, luxury, rapacity, pride, arrogance, and other evils. The clergy were emphatically commanded to free themselves of these abuses and severe orders were given to his legates to root out these evils.[4] In 1215 the Lateran Council was called for the "extirpation of vices, the planting of virtues, the correction of abuses, and the reformation of morals." All the clergy were urged to note the evils needing amendment and to correct the same.[5] In a sermon opening this remarkably representative council the Pope urged the clergy to reform themselves so that they could the better lead their flocks aright.[6] Many reformatory measures were enacted by this Council. Nepotism was prohibited, monastic abuses were corrected; pluralities were forbidden; the extravagant use of relics was curtailed;

[1] Greenwood, v., 651.
[2] *Ep.*, i., 130.
[3] *Gesta*, sec. 133.
[4] *Ep* , i., 79, 80.
[5] *Ibid.*, xvi., 30–34. Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, i., 41, 46.
[6] Matt. Paris, an. 1215; Murat, vii. 893; Raynaldus, an. 1215.

the extortions and simony of the clergy were abolished and renewed stress was laid on the canons of celibacy.[1]

The doctrinal changes instituted by Innocent III. were likewise important. The dogma of transubstantiation was canonised by the Lateran Council in 1215. Before that time there had been many and divergent views concerning this important subject. The leading motive which actuated Innocent in having this doctrine carefully defined was to destroy heresy. In consequence of the new dogma the sacerdotal body was elevated by being given a holier character while each individual priest employed this new power as a badge of divine dignity. All discussion about transubstantiation now ceased. Heresy was more clearly defined than ever and the Inquisition was canonised. At the same time the unity of the Church on its doctrinal side was given greater emphasis. The canonical restrictions on marriage were relaxed. The earlier rigid law had led to grave abuses, since the clergy annulled marriages and bastardised the offspring while the laity made it an excuse for divorce and licentious passion. The prohibition of marriage between the relative of a second wife and a first was removed. The degree of consanguinity and affinity was reduced from the seventh to the fourth canonical degree. Secret marriages were prohibited. The publication of the bans was made necessary. Confession and penitential satisfaction were prescribed as obligatory at least once a year under the penalty of excommunication. Physicians were likewise required to send all the sick to the priest first to have their souls cured before any effort was

[1] Lea, *Hist. of Sac. Celib.* By the thirteenth century celibacy was generally recognised as a canon all over the Latin Church, but secret alliances continued as an unmitigated evil.

made to heal the body. The penalty for disobedience was exclusion from the communion.

The administrative reforms of Innocent III. embraced a wide range of measures. Honorary precedence was granted to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Elections to vacancies in the Church were reduced to three forms: (1) A committee of three of the electors was to take the votes and to declare who had received "the greater and sounder" number; (2) a committee was to be empowered to appoint for the whole body of electors; (3) a choice was to be made by acclamation. All lay interference was excluded, otherwise the election would be *ipso facto* illegal. Papal confirmation and the right of revision were carefully guarded. Pluralities were strictly prohibited. Tithes were given precedence over all other taxes and dues, and the clergy were urged to guard the property and to collect all monies of the Church.[1] The right to transfer ecclesiastics was reserved to the Pope alone.[2] Finally the Inquisition was instituted for the purpose of suppressing heresy, of enforcing doctrines and ordinances, and of reforming the Church.

Innocent III. as head of the great Church easily outranked every ruler of his day and stands high among the greatest leaders of the Middle Ages and of all ages. A contemporary describes him as "A man of wonderful fortitude and wisdom—one who had no equal in his own day; whereby he had been able to do acts of miraculous power and greatness." If Hildebrand was the Julius, Innocent was the Augustus of the Papal Empire. He seldom miscalculated—his clear intellect never missed an opportunity—his calculating spirit rarely erred—and

[1] *Ep.*, i., 205, 217, 250, 292, 294, 388, 416, etc.
[2] *Gesta*, sec. 34–45.

he combined forbearance with vigour. "Order, method, unswerving resolution, inexorable determination, undaunted self-assertion, patience, vigilance, and cunning, all co-operating to the accomplishment of a single well-defined object—and that object the unlimited extension of the political power of the Pontiff of Rome—had achieved a signal triumph over the irregular, the selfish, and the impulsive political opposition of the secular powers."[1]

The moral character of his reign was variously viewed by contemporaries. The English clergy generally disliked him and a writer of the day asserted that his death, July 26, 1216, caused more joy than sorrow. St. Luitgarde, the prioress of a Cistercian Convent in Brabant, said that in a vision she had seen him in purgatory enveloped in flames for his sins.[2] The crimes of ambition, cruelty, deceit and treachery were charged against him as a shrewd political intriguer. The practical charity and genuine humility of an earlier day—when he washed and kissed the feet of twelve poor men taken from the street every Saturday[3]—seemed to disappear in the multiplied duties of a world ruler. His piety, honesty of purpose, and sincere conviction of his great mission cannot be questioned. Yet for some reason the Church, for which he did so much, has never seen fit to canonise this great Pope.

No other wearer of the papal tiara has left behind him so many results pregant with good and ill for the future of the Church. Under him the Papacy reached the culmination of its secular power and prerogatives. The principles of sacerdotal government

[1] Greenwood, v., 666.

[2] Raynaldus, an. 1216, sec. 11; Fleury, *H. E.*, xvi., 426.

[3] *Gesta*, sec. 134.

were fully and intelligently elaborated. The code of ecclesiastical law was completed and enforced. All the Christian princes of Europe were brought to recognise the overlordship of the successor of St. Peter. All the clergy obeyed his will as the one supreme law. Heresy was washed out in blood. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the dreams of Hildebrand had been realised. Yet in this very greatness, wealth, and strength, were the germs of weakness and disease which were eventually to overthrow the great structure reared by Innocent III. and his predecessors.

SOURCES.

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Colby, C. W., *Selections from the Sources of English History.* Lond. and N. Y., 1899.

2.—Gee, H., and Hardy. W. J., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Lond., 1896.

3.—Henderson, E. F., *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* N. Y., 1892.

4.—Innocent III., *The Mirror of Man's Lyfe.* Lond., 1576. *The Droome of Doomsday.* Tr. by G. Gascoigne. Lond., 1576. *Bull of March 3, 1216.* Tr. by W. Beaumont. Lond., 1886.

5.—Lee, G. C., *Leading Documents of English History.* Lond., 1900.

6.—Ogg, F. A., *A Source-Book of Mediæval History.* N. Y., 1908.

7.—Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History*, i., 338.

8.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source-Book for Mediæval History*, 496, 497, 535, 537.

B.—SECONDARY:

1.—SPECIAL:

1.—Bower, A., *History of the Popes*, vi., 183 *ff.*

2.—Greenwood, T., *Cathedra Petri*, v., 321–668.

3.—Gurney, J. H., *Four Ecclesiastical Biographies.* Lond., 1864.

Note:—There is no good biography of Innocent III. in English. Langen, Hurter, Delitzsch have excellent works in German, and Jorry and Luchaire in French.

II.—GENERAL:

Adams, 354, 269, 393, 414. Allen, ii., 73, 80, 82, 90, 99, 178. Alzog, ii., 411–421. Bryce, ch. 13. Butler, ch. 81, 82. Coxe, lect. 7, sec. 6. Creighton, i., 21. Crooks, ch. 34. Darras, iii., 311 *ff.* Döllinger, iv., ch. 3, sec. 3. Emerton, ch. 10. Fisher, pd. 6, ch. 3. Foulkes, 369, 398. Gibbon, vi., 36. Gieseler, ii., §54. Gilmartin, ii., ch. 5–6. Gregorovious, bk. ix., ch. 1–3. Guizot, *Hist. of Fr.*, ch. 18. Hallam, iii., ch. 6. Hardwick, ch. 10, sec. 1. Hare, ch. 13. Hase, sec. 192. Ingham, ch. 1. Jennings, i., ch. 13. Kurtz, sec. 96–109. Milman, bk. 9, ch. 1–10. Milner, iii., cent. 12, ch. 6. Moeller, ii., 275. Mosheim, cent. 11, pt. 2, ch. 2. Neander, iv., 173. Platina, ii., 68–73. Reichel, 242 *ff.* Robertson, bk. 6, ch. 1. Robinson, ch. 14. Tout, ch. 14.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AT ITS HEIGHT

OUTLINE: I.—Characteristics of the thirteenth century. II.—Territorial extent and wealth of the Church. III.—Organisation of the papal hierarchy completed. IV.—The legal system of the Church. V.—The official language and ritual of the Church. VI.—The sacramental system. VII.—The employment of art. VIII.—The Church moulded the civilisation of Europe. IX.—Sources.

THE thirteenth century was an age "of lofty aspirations unfulfilled, of brilliant dreams unsubstantial as visions, of hopes ever looking to fruition and ever disappointed. The human intellect awakened, but as yet the human conscience slumbered, save in a few rare souls who mostly paid in disgrace or death the penalty of their precocious sensitiveness."[1] The thirteenth century left as a legacy to the fourteenth century vast activity in intellectual progress, but a spiritual desert. Society was harder, coarser, and more worldly than ever.

Everywhere in western Europe the Church seemed to have attained the extreme limits of its claims. The papal theory was triumphant. Temporal rulers were everywhere subservient to the ecclesiastics. Locally the clergy ruled the masses in morals and religion; they controlled education and intelligence; and they practically settled all social and industrial questions.

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, iii., 57.

At the same time the spirit of asceticism was never more pronounced than in the early Cistercians, Carthusians, Dominicans, Franciscans, and other orders. Mysticism stood like a stone wall to stem the tide of worldliness, of wickedness, and of disbelief.[1] When St. Bernard preached to the students at Paris on the vanity of study and induced twenty of them to follow him into the cloister at Clairvaux he was attempting a very significant social revolution which culminated in St. Dominic and St. Francis. Nevertheless, in the very face of the ascendancy of the Roman hierarchy and notwithstanding the spiritual revival within the Church, there appeared a vast amount of heresy, of irreverence, and of independence. The spirit of individuality was abroad. Men became less obedient to authority and began to doubt the truth of what was taught them. This wide-spread distrust led to a shifting from one authority to another, rather than an entire rejection of all authority.[2]

The wealth and power of the clergy and nobility had decreased; the burghers had advanced to a position of influence and self-consciousness. Guilds, the awakened spirit of nationality, and self-governing communes were democratic factors to be taken into account. The rise of the lower classes, and the consequent decline of the upper classes, show that a new era is dawning over Europe. The bourgeois literature reveals a mocking contempt for nobles and bishops alike. There was a great deal of flippant wit which spared no topic and no individual. "God and the devil, Aristotle

[1] Moeller, ii., 436.

[2] Munro, "The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century," in *An. Rep. Am. Hist. Assoc.*, 1906, i., p. 45.

and the Pope, canon and feudal law, Cistercians and priests were held up to ridicule."[1] The subjects of popular songs are no longer exclusively the virtues of asceticism and humility, obedience to God and the feudal lord; but love of woman and the carnal joys of life have become popular themes. Villains achieve paradise by trickery. Men continually outwit Satan. A famous jongleur even shakes dice with St. Peter, and beats him at the game. Verily a new chapter was opening in the history of Europe.

Severe criticism of the iniquity and depravity of the clergy, their greed for wealth and position, and particularly their contempt for their sacred obligations, came from several sources.

(1) The best men in the Church, among whom are Popes, bishops, abbots, priests, and monks. Their letters and sermons reveal flagrant abuses and an earnest cry for reform.

(2) The acts of Church councils and synods show the general recognition among the clergy of the presence of grave irregularities and evils, and also a consciousness of their destructive tendencies.

(3) The general impression of selfishness and wickedness, which the Church officials made, soon was reflected in the satirical poems of the popular troubadours and by the sprightly versifiers of the courts.[2]

(4) The laity of course were not slow to understand conditions and became scathing critics. These lay censors in many instances went far beyond the

[1] Munro, "The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century," in *An. Rep. Am. Hist. Assoc.*, 1906, i., p. 47.

[2] Robinson, *Readings*, i., ch. 17.

clerical reformers. While the better clergy urged the elimination of current abuses not one of them dreamed of denying the fundamental doctrines of the Church or the efficacy of its ceremonies. On the contrary, the lay leaders became very extreme. They declared that the Church was the creation and home of the devil; that no one ought to believe any longer that salvation came only through sacerdotal ministrations; that all theatrical ceremonies were of no avail; that the masses, relics, holy water, and indulgences were mere priestly tricks for money-making purposes and not certain means of gaining paradise. These extreme opponents of the Church soon gained followers all over Christendom, from all social classes and on account of a great many reasons.

From the standpoint of ecclesiastical law, however, these drastic critics who questioned the teachings of the Church, and proposed to repudiate it, were guilty of the grave crime of heresy. The attempt to crush the wide-spread heresies of the thirteenth century forms an awful chapter in the history of the mediæval Church. The rise of the Albigenses, the Waldenses, and other heretical sects forced the Church to take drastic measures against these dangerous foes. Before the close of the twelfth century secular rulers were induced to take measures against heresy. In England Henry II. in 1166 ordered that no one should harbour heretics, and that any house in which they were received should be burned. In Spain the King of Aragon in 1194 decreed that any one who should listen to the Waldensians, or even give them food, should have his property confiscated and suffer death. These measures began a series of merciless decrees which even

the most enlightened rulers of the thirteenth century passed against heretics and their abettors.[1]

The Church was not slow to utilise this power. A determination to extirpate these dangerous heretics with the sword produced the crusade against the Albigensians. The Inquisition was also organised to ferret out secret heretics and to bring them before inquisitorial tribunals for punishment. The unfairness of the trials and the heartless treatment of suspects have rendered the name of the Inquisition infamous.[2]

From an early day the Church exercised a censorship over all books.[3] The first specific instance was that of a synod of bishops in Asia Minor about 150 A.D., which prohibited the *Acta pauli*. After that the condemnation of books was not at all uncommon.[4] The first papal Index was issued in 494 by Pope Gelasius I., who made a definite catalogue of works prohibited. Councils condemned books as heretical, while Popes prohibited their use, destroyed them, and punished those who violated the law. This policy was continued throughout the Middle Ages. Naturally the Church was just as desirous of getting rid of heretical books as of suppressing the obnoxious authors.[5]

In territorial extent the Roman Church of the thirteenth century included Italy and Sicily, Spain except the southern part, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, England, Ireland, and Scotland, Scandinavia and Iceland, the Eastern Empire, though but temporarily, and Palestine for a short period. In size, therefore,

[1] *Translations and Reprints*, iii., No. 6.
[2] See Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, for best discussion of this institution.
[3] See Acts. xix. 19, for Biblical authority.
[4] Putnam, *Censorship of the Church of Rome*, i., 58–61.
[5] *Ibid.*, 64–67.

it surpassed the old Roman Empire at its greatest height. The boundary lines of this great papal Empire were widened still further by the zealous missionary work encouraged by the Supreme Pontiff in Europe among the Slavs, Prussians, Finns, and Mohammedans in Sicily and Spain; in Asia among the Tartars, Mongols, and Moslems; in Africa among the Mohammedans[1]; in America among the inhabitants of Iceland, Greenland, and "Vineland"—possibly even on the New England coast. These fruitful labours were conducted chiefly by the Franciscans and the Dominicans.

The wealth of the Church at this time consisted of lands and buildings; Church furniture, utensils, and ornaments; and money derived from Church lands, the sale of privileges, the gifts of the pious, tithes, and the fees for various kinds of religious service. In the United States churches must rely wholly upon voluntary support. It was not so with the mediæval Church. The tithes were regular taxes and those persons upon whom they were levied had to pay them just as taxes imposed by governments must be paid to-day. Wide-spread complaint came from both clergy and laity that these taxes were unjust. The Church actually owned about one third of Germany, nearly one fifth of France, the greater part of Italy, a large section of Christian Spain, a big portion of England, perhaps one third, and important regions in Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary. The papal states in Italy, running diagonally across the peninsula, were ruled by the Pope as a temporal prince. These extensive territorial possessions together with the great wealth made the Church the mightiest secular power

[1] Neander, iv., 1–82; Kurtz, i., 120–138.

in the world and put into the hands of the Church thousands of lucrative sinecures, coveted and too often secured by persons wholly unfitted for the spiritual functions of the office. Through these extensive possessions the Church was beyond all question the greatest economic and industrial power in Europe. The Church was led to adopt feudalism and thus the Pope became the most powerful feudal overlord in Europe. Furthermore, the Church, because of its vast domains and enormous income, was enabled to support itself by its own perpetual wealth. In consequence many evils and abuses sprang up,[1] or were introduced, which led to the decline of the Church and the numerous demands for reformation. It must be said, however, to the credit of the Church that these resources were used to excellent advantage in furthering charity of all sorts and in caring for the poor and unfortunate.

During this period the organisation of the papal hierarchy was perfected. At the head stood the all-powerful and absolute Pope as God's agent on earth; hence, at least in theory and claim, he was the ruler of the whole world in temporal and spiritual affairs. He was the defender of Christianity, the Church, and the clergy in all respects. He was the supreme censor of morals in Christendom and the head of a great spiritual despotism. He was the source of all earthly justice and the final court of appeal in all cases. Any person, whether priest or layman, could appeal to him at any stage in the trial of a great many important cases. He was the supreme lawgiver on earth, hence he called all councils and confirmed or rejected their decrees.

[1] In this century it became customary for Popes to fill many benefices themselves and to receive all or half of the first year's income from those appointed.

He might, if he so wished, set aside any law of the Church, no matter how ancient, so long as it was not directly ordained by the Bible or by nature. He could also make exceptions to purely human laws and these exceptions were known as dispensations.[1] He had the sole authority to transfer or depose bishops and other Church officers. He was the creator of cardinals and ecclesiastical honours of all kinds. He was the exclusive possessor of the universal right of absolution, dispensation, and canonisation. He was the grantor of all Church benefices. He was the superintendent of the whole financial system of the Church and of all taxes. He had control over the whole force of the clergy in Christendom, because he conferred the *pallium*,[2] the archbishop's badge of office. In his hands were kept the terrible thunders of the Church to enforce obedience to papal law, namely, excommunication and the interdict.

Excommunication meant for a private person that he was a social outcast, excluded from all legal protection and deprived of the sacraments which were "the life blood of the man of the Middle Ages." His property might be confiscated without the possibility of recovery. Death and hell were sure to be his doom if repentance and absolution did not occur. And these same terrible results might even be extended to his descendants. Excommunication for a king meant, in addition to the same treatment as a private individual, the deprivation of all authority and the absolution of subjects from all obedience. Excom-

[1] Examples: permit to cousins to marry; release of a monk from his vow.

[2] This is a narrow woollen scarf made by the nuns of St. Agnes in Rome.

munication was the greatest moral power in all history and effective simply because the Christian opinion of the age responded to it and enforced it. By its use the Pope subjected to his will such powerful personages as Henry IV. of Germany, Henry II. of England, Philip (IV.) Augustus of France, Frederick II. of Germany, John of England, and countless lesser persons all over Christendom.[1] The power of excommunication was exercised by the Pope for the whole Church, by the bishop for his diocese, and even by subordinate Church officials. The formula and ceremony for excommunication were not uniform either in time or place but varied greatly.[2]

The interdict was directed against a city, a region, or a kingdom. It was used for the purpose of forcing a city or a ruler to obedience, as for example the interdict laid on Rome in 1155, and that on England, which lasted six years three months and fourteen days, to subdue the obstinate King John; or to enforce the ban of excommunication[3]; or to collect debts[4]; or to wreak vengeance for the death or maltreatment of a son of the Church.[5] The interdict was proclaimed in a papal bull and read by the clergy of the region affected to the congregations every Sunday for some weeks before it went into operation. Then all religious rites and sacraments ceased except baptism, confession, and the viaticum.[6] All the faithful were ordered to dress like penitents and to pray for the removal of the cause

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 235–286.
[2] The ceremony of bell, book, and candle was the most common.
[3] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 395, 397, 403, 404, 405, 412.
[4] *Ibid.*, 442, 448.
[5] *Ibid.*, 384, 463.
[6] Matth. Paris, *Hist. Maj.*, an. 1208, 1214.

of the curse. Thus the interdict resembled a raging pestilence and made a deep impression on the ignorant masses. It practically stopped all civil government, for the courts of justice were closed, wills could not be made, and public officials of all kinds were forbidden to act. Naturally it led to many very superstitious tales. For instance, the valley of Aspe in Béarn was cursed for seven years and during that time it was said that women bore no children, cattle gave no increase, and the land produced no crops or fruit.[1]

The use of such powerful weapons as excommunication and interdict was soon greatly abused. Popes and bishops employed this power out of spite, or hatred or for ambitious ends.[2] Scheming rulers enlisted papal, or episcopal, help of this sort to humble political rivals and for purely secular ends such as enforcing laws and collecting obligations.[3] In fact so wide-spread was the employment of these powers that by the fourteenth century half of the Christians in Europe were under the ban.[4] It was taught, moreover, that however illicit or apparently unfair or unwarranted, still the ecclesiastical mandates were to be obeyed. Hence Popes even granted the right not to be excommunicated without good cause.[5] Before long these religious curses degenerated to the point where they were applied to animals and inanimate objects, of which there are many illustrations. For instance two of St. Bernard's monks cursed the vineyard of a rival monk and it became

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 427.
[2] *Ibid.*, 417, 419, 420–421, etc.
[3] *Ibid.*, 440.
[4] *Ibid.*, 417.
[5] *Ibid.*, 418.

sterile until St. Bernard himself removed the blight.[1] A certain priest, noticing that the fruit of a neighbouring orchard had a stronger attraction for the children of his congregation than the divine service, excommunicated the orchard, whereupon it remained barren until the ban was taken off.[2] At the request of the farmers, the Bishop of Comminges cursed the weeds in their fields with the desired result.[3] St. Bernard, however, capped the climax of these absurdities when he solemnly excommunicated the devil.[4] After the thirteenth century the same weapons were used against leeches, rats, grasshoppers, snails, bugs, and pests of all kinds. In fact as late as 1648 a similar formula was given based on the forty-ninth psalm and the eleventh chapter of Luke.[5]

The efficacy of excommunication was likewise brought into service to protect property. For instance the Archbishop of Campostella in the twelfth century excommunicated any one who should steal or mutilate the manuscript history of his diocese. The Abbot of Sens in 1123 cursed on his death-bed any successor who should sell, lend, or lose any of the twenty volumes in the abbey library. Clement III. encouraged Bologna University by anathematising any person who should offer a higher rent for rooms used by students or teachers. Later, copyrights were protected by the same power and stolen property was recovered.[6] Letters bestowing the power of excommunication were soon purchased and used for all sorts of mercenary purposes.[7] John

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 427.
[2] *Ibid.*, 428; Agnel, *Curiosites Judiciaires du Moyen-Âge*, *26*.
[3] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 428. [4] *Ibid.*, 429.
[5] *Ibid.*, 433. See *Translations and Reprints*, iv., No. 4.
[6] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 435–437.
[7] *Ibid.*, 451; see Letter of Innocent III. in *Regest.*, lib. x., ep. 79.

Gerson of the University of Paris denounced Pope Martin V. for saying that as Pope he congratulated himself because he was no longer in danger of excommunication.[1] Gradually there came to be drawn up a list of no less than one hundred sins which were *ipso facto* followed by excommunication. Many of these are of the most trifling character, like that of collecting toll from a priest on crossing a bridge.[2] But this evil was offset by the ease with which one could purchase absolution.

The papal court, or curia, by the thirteenth century included an enormous number of persons both secular and ecclesiastic with all kinds of duties. The financial section was in many ways the most important one.[3] All members of the curia, which resembled the court of an Emperor, were directly responsible to the Pope. The cardinals were the most dignified and powerful members. Papal legates from the court swarmed over all Europe commissioned with unlimited authority to execute papal commands and to uphold papal claims. They ranged from primates to petty priests and monks, were directly subject to the Pope, and were feared and hated by the clergy and laity alike.

The College of Cardinals created in 1059 had come to play a marked rôle in ecclesiastical affairs in addition to their original duties. Their office ranked next to that of the Pope and they were called the "Holy and Sacred College." Foreigners were first appointed as cardinals in the thirteenth century. A distinct dress was assumed. The red hat was given by Innocent IV. (1245); the purple robe was bestowed by Boniface

[1] Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 455.
[2] *Ibid.*, 457.
[3] Waker, *Kirchliches Finanzwesen der Päpste.*

VIII. (1297); the white horse, red cover, and golden bridle were added by Paul II. (1464); and the title of "Eminence" was created by Urban VIII. (1630). These cardinals were shrewd politicians for the most part and hence divided into French, German, and Italian parties. They secured their appointments ofttimes through favouritism or nepotism, hence were not always men of the most sterling worth. As members of the papal court they lived at Rome and were supposed to be occupied with ecclesiastical affairs in the capital or busy on important diplomatic missions. They were easily won away, however, from their lofty duties by secular princes and became involved in all sorts of questionable intrigues. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, to find the best men of the day like Dante and Petrarch denouncing them in unmeasured terms.

Below the cardinals in the hierarchy came the metropolitans, archbishops, and primates. The archbishops were the most numerous but the lowest in rank. The metropolitans ranked next and were found in the great cities. The primates had the highest rank but were comparatively few. It is doubtful whether altogether the archbishops in the thirteenth century numbered more than twenty-five. The primates, who had charge in a general way of what might be called the national churches, confirmed the election of bishops and archbishops in their dioceses, called and presided over national synods, held the superior ecclesiastical courts, performed the coronation ceremonies of kings and queens, and had general control of their districts. The archbishops ruled over a distinct province including several bishops, whose election and consecration they superintended, called and presided over provincial synods, inflicted censures and punishments on the

bishops for breaches of discipline, acted as court of appeal above the episcopal courts, and exercised general oversight concerning all Church affairs of the districts. The metropolitans, whose historical significance was practically lost by the thirteenth century, had essentially the same office as that of archbishop. Under the leadership of the higher ecclesiastics there was a tendency to form national churches. The primates and archbishops defended these national churches even against the Pope and frequently sided with the kings against the supreme Pontiffs. In Germany they helped elect the Emperor, played an important political rôle, and saved Germany from ruin again and again.[1] In France and England they were the trusted counsellors and advisers of the sovereign. Almost without exception they came from the nobility and were large landed proprietors as well as secular rulers.

The bishops, who came next in the scale of the hierarchy, were elected originally by the people and the clergy but that right was gradually usurped by the metropolitans and the secular rulers. The mitre and crosier were the emblems of the episcopal office. The Concordat of Worms in 1122 settled long disputes by giving both Pope and ruler a share in the election. By the thirteenth century, however, the Pope had come to have the upper hand in these ecclesiastical preferments. The total number of bishops in the thirteenth century was approximately 700.[2] The duties of the bishop were both spiritual and temporal. His office was one of the most important in the mediæval

[1] Kurtz, i., 166.

[2] Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ;* Lea, *Stud. in Ch. Hist.*, 61–109.

Church. He ruled over a diocese of any number of parish churches, but had his own especial church, which was called the cathedral, and usually surpassed all other churches of the diocese in size and beauty. He saw to it that public services were conducted in the proper manner. He overlooked the administration of charity. He tried to secure efficient subordinates who would fulfil all their duties, and he alone could ordain new priests or degrade the old. He enforced discipline and canon law. He exercised the rights of confirmation and holy orders, and consecrated *res sacræ* like churches and shrines. He usually supervised the monastic houses in his diocese.[1] And he himself conducted religious services of a special character in his cathedral or *domus dei*. He assumed judicial power over his clergy and in case of misbehaviour punished them by deposition or confinement in a cloister. He passed judgment on all questions of marriage, wills, oaths, usury, and similar subjects. In general each bishop, under the authority of the representative of St. Peter, was a little pope over that section of the Church which was under his jurisdiction[2] and he was regarded as the direct successor of the Apostles. On the temporal side the bishop was a landlord, governed a large estate, and performed those governmental duties which the king, particularly in Germany, thrust upon him. He did not own the land, but only used it. He himself was often a vassal, had a large number of vassals and sub-vassals under him, collected feudal dues from his inferiors, paid feudal tributes to his superiors, and was an integral part of the feudal system.

[1] Some monasteries secured papal exemption from episcopal control.

[2] Froude, *Short Stories of Great Subjects*, 54

His installation to office was invariably accompanied by the ceremony of feudal investiture. Indeed from many standpoints he was more of a feudal lord than a churchman. It is easy to see, therefore, what a powerful factor the bishop was in both secular and ecclesiastical affairs, and how sweeping was his influence.

There were several deviations from the regular office of bishop. The chor-bishop or "country bishop," who was little more than an assistant of the city bishop, had gradually died out by the thirteenth century.[1] The honorary bishop, or titular bishop, a title first applied to missionary bishops, still existed in Europe but with no regular diocese. The progress of Mohammedanism drove many regular bishops away from their episcopal seats in Asia, Africa, and Spain. But they were allowed to retain their titles and functions even though deprived of their dioceses, and successors were regularly elected. Again during the Crusades many bishoprics were established in the East. Through the failure of the Crusades, however, these bishops lost their dioceses, but they too were permitted to retain their titles in the hope of eventually recovering their possessions. They likewise served as assistants to bishops in western Europe and their successors were regularly appointed by the Pope. They became very independent and often caused the regular bishops much trouble. Efforts were made later to get rid of them but without success.

Connected with each bishop's cathedral was a chapter which probably grew out of the original college of presbyters who assisted the bishop in his spiritual and secular duties. As time passed and the Church

[1] Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, i., 353, 355; *Cath. Encyc.*

grew these presbyters came to be attached to the cathedral as a distinct body of the clergy. By the ninth century these clergy came to be known as a chapter and consisted of either the "seculars," *i.e.*, the clergy not bound by monastic vows and living in separate houses, or the "regulars," *i.e.*, the clergy living as monks in a common building. Thus the chapter came to have a regular organisation with officers whose duties were more or less clearly defined. At the head stood the bishop; then the dean, the real acting head; and after him the precentor, or chanter, who was a musical director; the chancellor, who had charge of the education of younger members, the library, correspondence, and the delivery of lectures and sermons; the treasurer, who was responsible for the funds of the church, the sacred vessels, the altar furniture, and the reliquaries; the sub-dean, the sub-chanter, and vice-chancellor; and the archdeacons, whose number depended on the size of the diocese, who executed episcopal orders, who acted as inspectors and had minor judicial functions, and who became so independent and powerful that the office was abolished in the twelfth century.[1] The remaining members of the chapter were called canons or prebendaries. During the absence of the canons their duties were performed by substitutes called vicars.

Each chapter had its own laws, endowments, fees, revenues, and jurisdiction over lands. The chapters often came into open conflict with the bishops[2] and tended to form alliances with Popes and rulers against the episcopal authorities. It was not uncommon,

[1] Kurtz, vol. i., 168. See Howson, *Essay on Cathedrals;* Freeman, *Cathedral Church of Wells;* Walcott, *Cathedralia.*

[2] Emerton, *Med. Europe,* 549.

either, to find chapters practically independent of the bishops with members appointed directly by the Pope. These bodies exercised great powers—they called councils, they tried clerical cases, they even excommunicated, and as little Colleges of Cardinals, usually at the king's suggestion, elected bishops.[1] Membership in a chapter was regarded as a fat berth and hence eagerly sought by leading families of nobility.

At the bottom of the hierarchical scale stood the priests who presided over the parishes, which were divided into city, village, and rural parishes, and were the lowest divisions of the Church. As a rule a parish contained at least ten families and varied from that to a considerable village, or a large section of a town. The appointment of the priests was made by the "Patron" of the parochial church, *i.e.*, the person who owned the church property, whether a layman or a clerical person. The appointee was confirmed by the bishop. Churches were thus frequently handed about from one owner to another like any feudal property and consequently the tendency was to secularise the priests as well as the higher clergy. Seeing this evil the monastic orders sought to reform the abuse by bringing priests under their control. The income of the priest was derived from lands belonging to the parish church, from tithes and from contributions, but as a rule it was scarcely more than enough to meet his scanty needs.[2] The priest was the only Church officer who came continually into direct touch with the masses of the people and, consequently, he it was who really controlled the destiny of both their bodies and

[1] This power had been given to them in the reforms of Gregory VII.

[2] Robinson, *Readings*, i., 361.

souls. In addition to conducting the regular services, he could administer or withhold the sacraments so necessary to salvation, and hence the destiny of all men rested in his hands. He absolved, baptised, married, and buried his parishioners. He monopolised the auricular confession and through it regulated the conscience, determined conduct, and cured the soul of sin. If advice and penance failed to keep the incorrigible sinner in the path of righteousness, his case could be carried to the spiritual court of the bishop, who had practically unlimited power. Each priest had not only certain duties to perform, but also possessed distinct rights and privileges, and a supernatural character which put him and his property above the common level of humanity. No longer a citizen of a state, the Church was his country, his home, and his family. No matter what crime he committed, the secular power could not arrest him—only a religious tribunal could try him and such bodies never shed human blood. Hence punishments for misdemeanours were comparatively light.

The parish church was the unit of mediæval civilisation and the priest was looked up to as the natural guardian of the community. He cared for both the souls and bodies of his flock. In addition to using every agency to induce his members to lead godly lives, it was his business to see that no dangerous characters lurked in the villages—heretics, sorcerers, or lepers.

The clergy were separated from the laity by a very pronounced differentiation. The sacred character imparted to the priesthood by the sacrament of ordination, the holy calling of the man of God who held in his hands the power of spiritual life and death,

and the enforcement of the canon of celibacy after a bitter struggle of more than a century, all tended to emphasise and magnify the wide gulf between the clergy and the laymen. The sacerdotal office was most highly respected as the certain avenue to social service, to fame, and to honour. It is no surprise, therefore, to see men of all ranks entering the ministry of the Church. For those of humble birth, the opportunity thus offered was about the only means of promotion in Europe. Once in the Church, talent and energy could always overcome lowly origin, and attain elevation to a high place. The annals of the hierarchy are full of the examples of those who rose from the meanest social ranks to the most commanding positions. Many of the greatest and best Popes had that experience.[1] Thus the Church constantly recruited its ranks with vigorous fresh blood. Not even the lot of the prince was envied by the priest. "Princes," asserted John of Salisbury, "derive their power from the Church, and are servants of the priesthood." Honorius of Autun wrote, "The least of the priestly order is worthier than any king." A great thing it truly was for the future of Europe that in those rough ages there existed a moral force superior to noble descent, to blue blood, and to martial prowess to point out the correct path, to uphold right, and to sanction eternal justice.

The *corpus juris canonici*, or canon law, which regulated all the workings of the hierarchy, included all the rules enacted by the Church for its relation with the secular power, for its own internal administration, and for the duties and conduct of its members. It differed

[1] Urban II., Adrian IV., Alexander V., Gregory VII., Benedict XII., Nicholas V., Sixtus IV., Urban IV., John XXII., Sixtus V., were among the many Popes of humble ancestry.

from the *jus ecclesiasticum*, or ecclesiastical law, in having the Church for its source, while the latter had the Church for its subject. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals continued to be the constitution of the Church. Various commentaries, all based upon the Decretals as the chief repertory, were made by prominent churchmen.[1] Gratian, a Camaldolensian monk, a professor in Bologna University, in 1250 first taught canon law as a distinct and complete system like Roman law. He published the *Decretum Gratiani*, a scientific digest of all canon laws, which soon superseded all other codifications and became the basis for many later commentaries.[2] Canon law was studied in all the mediæval universities. Regular faculties of canon law were established, which granted the degree of *doctores decretorum* after a course of six years' study. It was not long, therefore, until the Church was given a class of keen, well-drilled lawyers who gradually extended ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all religious duties; over baptisms, marriages, and deaths, and hence over legitimacy and succession; over all persons under religious vows, and consequently over the clergy, crusaders, widows, orphans, and minors; over heresy, blasphemy, and sacrilege; and over adultery, bigamy, fraud, and perjury. The canon law of the Church must also be given credit for laying the foundation for international law and serving as a model for constitutional law.

The papal penitentiary, or court, grounded on the

[1] Anselm of Milan (9th cent.), Regino of Prüm (10th cent.), Burchard of Worms (11th cent.), Ivo of Chartres (12th cent.), and Algerius of Liege (1120).

[2] The best edition is by Richter. Unfortunately there is no English translation.

"power of the keys," possessed original and appellate powers of first instance and last resort. It originated in 1215 at Rome and consisted of a body of canonists and theologians who acted as a unit under powers granted by the Pope.[1] It attempted to decide all cases of morals and discipline, oftentimes in virtual ignorance of the facts. During the thirteenth century penitentiaries were appointed in every bishopric to take cognisance of cases. Thus the eagle eyes of the supreme court of Rome were fastened on every breach of law throughout Christendom. Naturally many abuses were connected with such a system. In 1022 the Council of Seligenstadt complained that Rome had extended her jurisdiction even over the laity.[2] Through local representatives the papal penitentiary practically nullified the discipline of bishops and granted virtual immunity to offenders. Venality was an accompanying evil from the beginning. Absolution could easily be secured by the rich and influential and dispensations were sold for money. Of course this condition produced disastrous effects on morals. "Rome was a fountain of pardon for all infractions of the decalogue." Bishop Grosseteste declared about 1250 that the low morality of the priesthood was due to this system. Pardon was granted to both sides of the controversy. A priest stole a book from his own church, pawned it for money, and then excommunicated the unknown thief. He was discovered but pardoned on the ground that he could not interdict himself. Monks and nuns bought their way into convents and then purchased absolution for the act.

[1] Lea, *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, xxxi. to xxxv.
[2] *Ibid.*

By the thirteenth century the Roman ritual in the Latin language was practically in universal use. The Slavish liturgy had disappeared and in Spain alone the old national liturgy still lingered, though even there the Roman ritual was permitted. Latin had become the general official language of the Church. But it was not uncommon to give in the vernacular, besides the regular announcements, the confession of faith, the confession of sin with the general absolution, intercessions for the living and the dead, and the Lord's Prayer.

At this period of the Church's greatest power there was a noticeable revival of preaching caused by the monastic reformers like the Clugniacs, Cistercians, Dominicans, and Franciscans who earnestly preached repentance, and also by the tremendous crusading enthusiasm. All the heroes of monasticism, scholasticism, and the papal hierarchy were forceful preachers.[1] To accommodate these preachers pulpits were built against a pillar or in a corner of a nave. To the masses on popular occasions, and even in the regular services, they spoke in the vernacular, but all stately addresses in synods and councils were delivered in the speech of Rome. Popes and councils urged the importance of rearing a race of learned clergy who could give the Church intelligent leadership. The synod of Treves in 1221 went so far as to forbid uneducated and inexperienced priests to preach, because it caused more harm than good. As a result of this wide-spread preaching the Church was given a unity of doctrine and feeling which it had not enjoyed before.

[1] One of the most famous preachers of the 13th century was the German Franciscan, Berthold of Regensburg (d. 1272), who often preached to crowds numbering 100,000.

The number of sacraments was generally recognised by the thirteenth century as seven.[1] Peter Lombard's *Sentences* first outlined them and Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) practically established them, although they were not officially adopted until the Council of Florence in 1439. Theoretically the sacraments were believed to confer grace, "the fulness of divine life," upon the recipients and to make them different persons with new characters. This change was produced by God through the Church and was based upon the idea that this life should be consecrated and sanctified by religion in all its various relations. Hence baptism suggested birth to a new spiritual life free from the sin due to Adam's fall; the Lord's Supper gave nutriment to preserve life and strength; penance indicated a recovery to health after sickness incident to sin; confirmation marked the growth of righteous life to maturity; extreme unction suggested diet and exercise in convalescence and purified and refreshed the spirit of the dying; ordination marked a promotion to a higher consecrated life and to new duties; and marriage meant the assumption of new social relations which could never be severed. The Church held that all these sacraments were instituted by Jesus and used by him personally, although baptism and the Lord's Supper were the most important. Peter Lombard said that if Christ did not employ them, the Apostles at least did. Baptism, confirmation, and ordination, it was held, imparted an indelible character, therefore could not be repeated. All consecrations and blessings were looked upon as different from the sacraments and were called "Sacramentalia." It was asserted also that the ad-

[1] See Robinson, *Readings*, i., 348.

ministration of the sacraments in the hands of a bad priest was valid.

The mass continued to be the heart, life blood, and very centre of all worship. It was believed to be a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God for the sins of the world whenever the sacrament was celebrated. Christ was recrucified as on the cross at each mass. The eucharist gave spiritual nourishment to the communicant, averted evils and brought blessings, and, with penance, removed the guilt of sin. Transubstantiation became a fixed dogma in the thirteenth century. Up to the ninth century the Church unanimously believed that the real body and blood of Christ were administered to those who received the sacrament of the eucharist, but Christians differed widely as to the nature and manner of their presence and no Pope or council had settled the question. In 831 Radbert wrote a famous book on the subject in which he held that after consecration only the figure of bread and wine was present and that the rest was literal body and blood and that this body and blood was the same as that born of Mary, crucified, and raised from the dead. This work created a warm discussion which lasted for four centuries and provoked many bitter individual quarrels. Innocent III. in 1215 settled the dispute by making the dogma of transubstantiation a part of the constitutional law of the Church and at the same time ordered all the laity to go to confession and to partake of the eucharist at least once a year. The dogma did not pass unquestioned, although the common people had no difficulty in believing it.[1] As a result it led to the deification of the bread and wine, to the use of beautiful golden or silver

[1] John Pegues Assinus, a doctor of Paris University, substituted the word consubstantiation.

urns and cups for them, to the construction of a costly tabernacle in which to keep the sacred elements, to lamps and decorations, to solemn processions, to a pompous ceremony, to bowing the knee before the host in the church and on the streets and to prayer to the host as the most important part of worship, and to the celebration throughout the whole Church of an annual festival of the Holy Sacrament (1264). The cup was withheld from the laity [1] and given only to the priests after the eleventh century because it was feared that the wine might be spilled and also because it was believed that the body and blood of Jesus were fully present in both elements.[2] Wafers, called the host, were substituted for the broken bread. The mass soon became an object of commerce. Private masses for the living and particularly for the dead, begun in the eighth century, were very common in the thirteenth, so much so, in fact, that certain priests had no other function than that of saying masses for the dead. All over Christendom endowments were given for these masses and an army of priests did nothing else. By refusing mass the clergy could exert strong pressure on individuals and governments. The mass was held to be absolutely necessary to salvation, and the eucharist was even given to little children, although in the thirteenth century it was restricted to children under seven. It also had a marked effect upon church architecture by increasing the number of altars in the church in order to accommodate the increasing number of private masses. All the physical and metaphysical

[1] Kings, at their coronation, and sometimes at the approach of death, were by a special favour given the cup.

[2] Alexander of Hales gave the dogmatic justification of this idea.

education of the age turned upon the question of the mass.[1]

Penance played a very important part in the Church in the thirteenth century and received its final form in the Council of Florence in 1439. As early as the fifth century a regular criminal code developed in the Church and in the seventh century a Grecian monk who was archbishop enacted a body of severe laws for penitential discipline which remained in authority until the twelfth century. The climax was reached in the thirteenth century when every diocese had its own penitential code and public penance had been replaced by private penance. Penance was simply the punishment prescribed by the priest to remove the guilt of sin, and usually consisted of fasts, prayers, pilgrimages, and acts of charity and mercy. The Church early permitted penance to be paid by substituting money payments for some pious enterprise.[2] Furthermore, it was generally held that penance afflicted on one person could be paid by another; for example, a penance of seven years could be accomplished in seven days by a sufficient number of co-workers.[3] Even Thomas Aquinas said that as long as the debt was paid it mattered little who paid it. Indulgences and papal pardons paralleled the history of penance. The power to show leniency, or to shorten or to lengthen the character or the time of penance, was early recognised to be in the bishop's hands.[4] From this idea there gradually arose a regular system of commutation which reached the highest point during

1 Wasserschleben, *Bussordunung*, Halle, 1851.
2 A journey to the Holy Land took the place of all penance.
3 Mansi, *Coll. Concil.*, xviii., 525.
4 Fifth Canon of the Council of Ancyra in 314.

the crusade movement. The theory was most fully stated by Thomas Aquinas[1] and Alexander of Hales.[2] They asserted that after the remission of the eternal punishment due for sin there still remained a temporal punishment to be undergone either in this life or in purgatory; that temporal pain might be remitted by the application of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints out of the treasury of the Church. The hierarchy was the custodian of that prerogative. But indulgence could be granted only to those who were in full communion with the Church and who manifested a contrite heart, made confession, and submitted to penance.[3] Penances were either general or local, or plenary or partial. The use of indulgences was very much abused since they were often granted only for money and because they were employed for trivial and secular purposes like building bridges[4] and improving roads.[5] They were even applied to the dead.[6] The doctrine of purgatory had developed by the twelfth century and was generally accepted in the thirteenth.[7]

Auricular confession, which seems to have been fully developed by the time of Innocent I.,[8] was required by Innocent III. after 1216 of all Church members at least once a year under penalty of exclusion from the Church. It was an essential part of the sacrament

[1] *Summa*, supplement, p. 3, qu. 25.
[2] *Summa*, p. 4, qu. 23, art. 1, 2, memb. 5, 6.
[3] Lea, *Indulgences*, 18 *ff.*
[4] Pflugh-Harttung, *Acta Pontiff.*, iii., n. 408; Potthast, *Regest.* n. 3799.
[5] Lea, *Indulgences*, 178.
[6] *Ibid.*, 314.
[7] *Ibid.*, 305, 310.
[8] *Epist.*, I Can., vii.

of penance and gave the priests a tremendous power over the people which was used both for good and ill. The synod of Toulouse in 1229 insisted on compulsory confession at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. Any breach of the confessional was visited by the fourth Lateran Council with excommunication, deposition, and imprisonment for life in a monastery. Confession was the bridle by means of which the laity were guided by the priesthood, hence the Church laid more and more importance upon the necessity of the practice as a duty.

Absolution grew up as a necessary part of auricular confession. Before the thirteenth century the priest acted ministerially and used the form: *domus absolvat te—misercatur tui omnipotens deus et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua.* These words are still found in the Greek Church and are also allowable in the Roman Catholic service. After the thirteenth century, however, the priest acted judicially and said: *ego absolvo te.* The priest's forgiveness was God's forgiveness. The requisites for absolution were: contrition of heart, promise of amendment of life, and reparation.

Extreme unction as a sacrament came into use rather late. Peter Lombard gave it fifth place among the seven sacraments. Original sin was atoned for in baptism, actual sins by penance, and extreme unction wiped away all remaining sins which would hinder the soul from entering its perfect rest. Hence it was given only to those who were mortally ill. In case of recovery, however, it could be repeated.[1] The eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, loins, and feet (except

[1] After receiving extreme unction recipients were forbidden to touch the ground again with their bare feet or to have marital intercourse.

of women) were anointed with holy oil consecrated by the bishop on Maundy Thursday. Confession and communion preceded the rite. These three together constituted the *viaticum* of the soul on its long journey.

From the time when private meeting places gave way to places of public worship, throughout its whole career, the Church has employed art for purposes of utility and instruction. The transitional character of the thirteenth century along social, ecclesiastical, intellectual, and political lines was also strongly marked in art. In the conflict between feudalism and royalty, monarchy gradually gained ground. The problem of human right appeared along with the problem of human might. Out of the composite struggle of kings, feudal barons, popes, bishops, abbots, and free cities emerged the recognised supremacy of papal authority as the one power above and behind all others. The episcopacy stood for the rights of the Pope, on the one hand, and the rights of the people, on the other. Next to the papal supremacy, stood the kingly prerogative. Under the double patronage of the Church and the state ecclesiastical art advanced with rapid strides.

Gothic architecture reached its highest development during the thirteenth century. Europe was covered with magnificent churches, cathedrals, and monasteries. Architecture was the dominant art of the Middle Ages. The church building occupied a unique place in the community. Everybody was a member of the Church and attended the one sacred edifice in the parish. The erection and beautifying of a new church was a matter of interest to all. Local pride was deeply touched. A strong rivalry soon developed, which led each village and city to outdo their neighbours by erecting larger, more expensive, and more beautiful

chapels and cathedrals. The church of that day was the centre not alone of religious activity, but also of local politics, of community business, of social gatherings, of education, and of the fine arts. It was the very heart of all life, and, hence, members lavished their affection, their time, and their wealth on it. Nothing in our community life to-day can be well compared with the church of that day. It was the town hall, art museum, club, public library, school, and church all in one. With us the religious interest of every community is divided among various denominations, while the differentiation of our other institutions has destroyed the earlier unity of interest.

The Gothic churches with pointed arches and flying buttresses lightened the masonry of the hitherto massive walls, pierced them with great, beautiful stained glass windows, and allowed the sunlight to stream into the dark interiors. Then mosaics, sculpture, fresco, and painting were used to enrich and decorate the inner parts. Mouldings and capitals, pulpits, altars, side chapels, choir screens, the wooden seats for the clergy and choristers, the reading desk, and the tombs were literally covered with carvings of leaf and flower forms, of familiar animals and grotesque monsters, of biblical scenes and ordinary incidents. The exteriors of these wonderful structures, which were marvels of lightness and delicacy of detail, were usually ornamented with an army of statues representing apostles, saints, donors, and rulers. Is it a matter of surprise that the bishops and clergy, who ruled over these Christian temples erected in love, in prayer, and in self-sacrifice, should be honoured and obeyed? These wonderful houses of religion were the glad free-will offerings of a devout and believing people to the mighty Roman

Catholic Church of which they were the proud, privileged members.

A splendid picture of the beautiful devotion of the people of a region in the erection of a magnificent cathedral is found in Chartres, France. That wonderful edifice was begun in 1194 and completed in 1240. To construct a building that would beautify their city and satisfy their religious aspirations the citizens contributed of their strength and property year after year for nearly half a century. Far from home they went to the distant quarries to dig out the rock. Encouraged by their priests they might be seen, men, women, and children, yoked to clumsy carts loaded with building materials. Day after day their weary journey to and from the quarries continued. When at night they stopped, worn out with the day's toil, their spare time was given up to confession and prayer. Others laboured with more skill but with equal devotion on the great cathedral itself. As the grand edifice grew year by year from foundation stone to towers, the inhabitants watched it with pious jealousy. At length it was completed; not, however, until many who had laboured at the beginning had passed away. Its dedication and consecration marked an epoch in that part of France.

Most historians are prone to dwell upon the evils of the Church in this period, as if they far outweighed the good. Many bishops were worldly and wicked, therefore the conclusion is drawn that all bishops were of that character, whereas out of the 700 bishops in Europe a very large proportion were comparatively faithful shepherds who were striving with all their might to realise the high ideals for which the Church stood. Many of the clergy were guilty of gross im-

morality, hence comes the sweeping assertion that all the clergy were unfit for their high and noble calling, while as a matter of fact, thousands of the priests obeyed the laws of the Church, led model God-fearing lives, and continually pointed out to their people the high and certain path to salvation. Abuses, corruptions, extortions, did exist in every quarter of Christendom. Bad clergymen did use their high prerogatives for base purposes. Many bishops, abbots, and priests were no more unworthy to be given extensive powers in trust than the unscrupulous politicians who often secure high places in our municipal, state, and national governments. The sinecures and benefices of the Church offered the same temptations to money-making and to questionable methods that our civil offices do to-day to the dishonest and unscrupulous office-holders. But all of the officials in the Church in the thirteenth century were no more guilty of these evils than are all public men in the United States to-day addicted to the practices of the base political tricksters. It seems to be a universal fact that one bad man in the Church attracts more attention and creates more comment than a multitude of good men.

The fundamental causes of the numerous evil practices in the Church are found in the wealth and power of the Roman ecclesiastical organisation, on the one hand, and the comparatively low moral standards of civilisation, on the other. Throughout its whole remarkable career of thirteen hundred years, the Catholic Church had denounced the bad and taught the good. Unfortunately in attempting to realise the kingdom of God on earth through that organisation which was assumed to be of divine origin, life and practice did not always harmonise with the doctrines

inculcated. The ideal and the real are seldom brought to coincide in any human institutions and it would be expecting a realisation of the well-nigh impossible to hope to see the consummation of that desirable condition in the mediæval Church when all the contradictory factors and forces are taken into account. But it can be safely asserted, when all debits and credits of baneful and beneficial are given just consideration, that the mighty Church at its height was the most powerful force in Europe for justice, for mercy, for charity, for peace among men, for honesty, for temperance, for human rights, for social service, for culture, for domestic purity, for obedience to law and order, and for a noble, helpful Christian life both for individuals and states.

The sublime foundations on which the Church rested,[1] the marvellous history it could point to, its peerless organisation, its vast wealth, its strong grip on the faith of the people, its close alliance with the state, all combined to make its officers, the clergy, the most influential social class in Europe. In their hands were the keys of heaven and without their permission no one could hope to enter; since they were about the only educated class, they wrote the books and directed all advance along intellectual, literary, and artistic lines. In short they moulded the progress of that day. They wrote public documents and proclamations for rulers, sat in royal councils, and acted as governmental ministers.[2] They dominated

[1] Read the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. (1302). Robinson, *Readings*, i., 346.

[2] As late as the thirteenth century, an offender who wished to prove that he was a priest in order to obtain the privilege of trial by a church court had to show that he could read a single line. This

every human interest, regulated more or less every phase of life in the Middle Ages, and conferred inestimable benefit upon Europe of that day and this.

The Church in this age was the dominant factor in European civilisation. It fashioned laws and dictated the policy of governments; it controlled education and intelligence; it influenced occupations and industries; it moulded social ideas and customs; and it set the standards of morality and determined the life and conduct of both this world and that to come. The Church was divided into two sharply defined classes: the laity and the priesthood. "The great division of mankind, which . . . had become complete and absolute, into the clergy . . . and the rest of mankind, still subsisted in all of its rigorous force. They were two castes, separate and standing apart as by the irrepealable law of God. They were distinct, adverse, even antagonistic, in their theory of life, in their laws, in their corporate property, in their rights, in their immunities. In the aim and object of their existence, in their social duties and position, they were set asunder by a broad, deep, impassable line."[1] The priesthood, with an indelible character, married to the Church, stood between God and man and tended to become "The Church."

The Church was essentially an organised state, thoroughly centralised, with one supreme head and a complete gradation of officials; with a comprehensive system of law courts for trying cases, with penalties covering all crimes, and with prisons for punishing offenders. It demanded an allegiance from all its

was called *benefit of clergy*. See Robinson, *Readings*, vol. i., ch. 16; Lea, *Hist. of Inq.*, iii., 57.

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christ.*, vi., 357.

members somewhat like that existing to-day between subjects and a state. It developed one official language, the Latin, which was used to conduct its business everywhere. Thus all western Europe was one great religious association from which it was treason to revolt. Canon law punished such a crime with death, public opinion sanctioned it, and the secular arm executed the sentence.

The Church Militant was thus an army encamped on the soil of Christendom, with its outposts everywhere, subject to the most efficient discipline, animated with a common purpose, every soldier panoplied with inviolability and armed with the tremendous weapons which slew the soul. There was little that could not be dared or done by the commander of such a force, whose orders were listened to as oracles of God, from Portugal to Palestine and from Sicily to Iceland.[1]

History records no such triumph of intellect over brute force as that which, in an age of turmoil and battle, was wrested from the fierce warriors of the time by priests who had no material force at their command, and whose power was based alone on the souls and consciences of men. Over soul and conscience their empire was complete. No Christian could hope for salvation who was not in all things an obedient son of the Church, and who was not ready to take up arms in its defence; and, in a time when faith was a determining factor of conduct, this belief created a spiritual despotism which placed all things within reach of him who could wield it.[2]

In the thirteenth century the mediæval Church was a completed institution and at the height of its power. Its rise from humble beginnings, by a multitude of explainable causes and forces, to this lofty

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inq.*, i., 4.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., 1.

position is a well-nigh incredible miracle. It was very different from all modern churches whether Catholic or Protestant, yet was the mother of all of them. Both theoretically and legally all persons in western Europe belonged to it and were ruled by it, except those who were expelled from it, and thus formed one mighty religious society, the like of which has not again appeared in Christendom. Unable during subsequent centuries to meet the demands of new and higher phases of civilisation, the mediæval Church broke up into the various Christian sects of to-day.

Sources

A.—PRIMARY:

1.—Eales, *Life and Works of St. Bernard.*
2.—Henderson, *Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.*
3.—Lea, C. H., *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century.*
4.—Migne, *Patrologia Latina.*
5.—Morley, *Mediæval Tales.*
6.—Robinson, *Readings in European History.*
7.—Steele, R., *Mediæval Lore.* Lond., 1893.
8.—Thatcher and McNeal, *A Source-Book for Mediæval History.*
9.—Univ. of Penn., *Translations and Reprints.*

B.—SECONDARY:

I.—SPECIAL:

1.—Bethune-Baker, J. F., *The Influence of Christianity on War.* Camb., 1888.
2.—Brace, G. L., *Gesta Christi.* Lond., 1886.
3.—Cornish, *Chivalry.*
4.—Cutts, E. L., *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages.* Lond., 1872. *Parish Priests and their People.* Lond., 1890.
5.—Döllinger, J. J. I., *Papal Fables of the Middle Ages.*
6.—Fournier, *Les officialités au moyen âge.*
7.—Gautier, *Chivalry.*

8.—Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars.*

9.—Lea, H. C., *History of Auricular Confession.* 3 vols. Phil., 1896. *History of the Inquisition.* 3 vols. *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy. Superstition and Force. Studies in Church History.*

10.—Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions.*

11.—Maitland, *The Dark Ages.*

12.—Milman, H. H., *History of Latin Christianity.* viii., bk. 14, ch. 1–10.

13.—Prévost, *L'église et les compagnes au moyen âge.*

14.—Rashdall, *History of the Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.*

15.—Smith, *The Troubadours at Home.*

II.—GENERAL.

Adams, *Med. Civ.*, ch. 16, 18. Blunt, i., ch. 10–12. Coxe, Lect. 5–7. Darras, iii., ch. 8–10. Dehorbe, ch. 11, 42. Fisher, pd. 6, ch. 6. Foulkes, ch. 11, 12. Gieseler, iii., ch. 1, 2, 5, and 6. Gilmartin, ii., ch. 5–13. Hardwick, ch. 8, 10, 11, 12. Hase, sec. 192–237. Hurst, i., ch. 50. Jennings, ii., ch. 12, 13. Knight, ch. 14–16. Kurtz, ii., 89–138. Milner, iii., cent. 12, 13. Moeller, ii., pd. 2, ch. 5; iii., ch. 2 and 3. Neander, iv. Robertson, bk. 5, ch. 13; bk. 6, ch. 6–8. Sikes, ch. 17.

INDEX

A

Abbots, 217, 218, 421; of Clugny, 429
Abelard, 511, 518, 559
Absolution, 590, 597
Abstinents, 204
Abubekr, 479
Abuses, clerical, 421, 426, 430, 432, 548, 563
Abu Taleb, 479
Acolytes, 63
Acre, fall of, 499
Actium, battle of, 41
Adalbert, 398, 425
Adaldag, 251
Adalgar, 251
Adelaide, 392, 402
Adelbert, 243
Adelbert of Bremen, 438
Adelbert of Prague, 249, 257
Adelpert, 165
Adhemar, Bishop of Pui, 494
Ærius of Sebasta, 220
African Church, 155
Agents at Eastern court, 299
Agilbert, 239
Agilulf, King, 243
Agnes, Empress, 451
Agobard of Lyons, 283, 364
Agriculture, 198
Aidan, 164
Alaric II., 296
Albertus Magnus, 525
Albigenses, 501, 506, 560, 562, 572
Alcuin, 249, 311, 318
Aldich, 335
Alemanni, 234, 243
Aleontera, order of, 514
Alexander II., 360, 364, 369, 442, 446, 451
Alexander III., 362, 364, 379, 413, 545
Alexander IV., 536
Alexander of Alexandria, 137, 138, 141, 349
Alexander of Hales, 597
Alexander the Great, 199, 318
Alexander Severus, 103, 268, 291
Alexius, Emperor, 493, 495
Ali, 479
Alliance of Church and State, 202, 204
Alliance of Pope and Franks, 302, 304, 305, 307
Alms, 352
Amania, 165
Ambrose, 170, 211, 213, 295, 368, 380
Ammon, 205, 208
Anacletus, 331
Anagni, 545
Anastasius, 174, 365
Andrew, St., 257
Angels, 354
Angles, 235
Anglo-Saxon invasion, 240
Anicetus, 155
Anne, 257
Ansgar, 250, 253, 341
Anthony of Alexandria, 205, 211
Anthony, order of, 514
Anthony, St., 203, 208, 427
Antioch, captured, 495
Antioch, Council of, 178, 348
Anti-Petrine view, 77
Antoninus Pius, 102
Apiarius, 167
Apostles, 56; and monasticism, 201; and the state, 290
Apostles' Creed, 356, 371

Apostolic Christianity, 202
Apostolic Church, 154, 160*ff.*, 202, 375
Apostolic constitutions, 163; canons, 178, 330, 331
Apostolic seat, 61
Apostolic succession, 61
Appeals to Rome, 155, 169, 175, 348, 562, 575
Aquileia, Council of, 171
Aquinas, Thomas, 373, 525, 592, 595, 596
Arabia, in 570, 476*ff.*; under Mohammed, 480
Arabs, 476*ff.*
Archbishops, 61; 22 in Europe, 315; 336; origin of, 348–350; power, 350; in 13th century, 581, 582
Archdeacons, 62
Architecture, 598, 599, 600
Arian controversy, 120, 136*ff.*, 175, 266, 294
Arian princes conquered, 302
Arianism, 143, 145, 189, 232, 233
Arians, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 166
Aristotle, 47
Arius, 137, 138, 141, 144
Arles, Council of, 119, 144, 162, 163, 175, 244, 293, 353
Arles, Council of, in 813, 313
Arnold, 16
Arnold of Brescia, 511, 518, 559
Arnoldites, 519
Arnulf, 387
Art, 42, 270
Asceticism, use of, 64, 199; attacks on, 218, 219
Ascetics, 203; none in early Church, 204; 427
Athalaric, 296
Athanasius, 9, 139, 141, 142, 144, 166, 181, 206, 209, 211, 212, 349
Athens, 48
Attila, 184
Augustine, St., 9, 168, 170, 211, 213, 372
Augustine's *City of God*, 318
Augustine, Abbot, 165, 235, 236, 237, 238
Augustine, Rule of, 511
Augustinians, 536, 539
Augustus, 48, 94
Aurelian, 105, 156
Aurelius, 330
Avars, 308, 309
Avis, order of, 514
Aymar, abbot of Clugny, 429

B

Babbio, 243
Baldwin of Bouillon, 494
Baldwin II., 513
Bans, 564
Baptism, 181, 219, 352, 372, 374, 375
Baptisteries, 375
Barbarian invasions, 169, 180, 183, 293, 357, 385; later, 388
Barbarians, conversion of, 230, 231
Baronius, 16
Basil, St., 139, 167, 210
Basil, Rule of, 212
Basil, Emperor, 257
Basques, 308
Baur, 17
Bavarians, 302, 308
Bede, 16, 73, 235, 240
Begging orders, 216, 518*ff.*, 536, 537
Beghards, 519, 520, 538
Beguins, 519, 520
Belisarius deposes a Pope, 297
Bells, 372
Benedict, 187, 213
Benedict VII., 402
Benedict VIII., 368, 407, 408, 420, 426
Benedict IX., 410, 420
Benedict X., 438, 439
Benedictine Rule, 190, 214–216, 428, 431, 432
Benedictines, 199, 248, 434
Benedictus Levita, 335
Berengar, 387
Berengar II., 392, 395
Bernard, St., 368, 369, 402, 491, 496, 511, 513, 516, 518, 570
Bernard of Quintavalle, 528
Bertha, 236
Bible manuscripts, 269
Bishop of Rome, 76, 77, 107, 149, 151, 153, 154, 155, 158; accepted as Peter's successor, 160, 170; claims appellate

Bishop of Rome—*Continued*
power, 165; greatest man in Western Europe, 168; settles disputes, 169; primacy of, 172, 175; power approved by Emperor, 178; calls councils, 294; becomes a temporal prince, 302
Bishoprics created in Germany, 247, 249, 253
Bishoprics founded in France, 303
Bishops, 57; equality of, 176; increase their power, 322; subjected to state, 337; election of, 351; duties, 351 *ff.*, 421; in the East, 501; in 13th century, 582 *ff.*
Bishops, provincial, 158
Björn, King, 253
Black friars, *see* Dominicans.
Blondel, David, 333
Bogaris, Duke, 256
Bohemia, 449
Bohemian Church, 255
Bohemians, 255, 391, 401
Bohemond, 494, 495
Boleslav the Cruel, 255
Boleslaw II., 369
Bologna University, 545, 579, 589
Bonasus, 220
Bonaventura, 537, 538
Boniface, 165, 305, 309
Boniface, St., 244 *ff.*, 330, 333
Boniface I., 295
Boniface IV., 378, 380
Boniface VII., 402
Boniface VIII., 413, 525, 581
Borziway, Duke, 255
Bossuet, 16
Brescia, Council of, 467
Bretons, 308
Breviarium, 330
Bridge Brothers, 515
Bridget, St., 240
British Christians, 238
Brotherhoods of the Peace of God, 359
Brothers and Sisters of Penitence, 530
Brothers of the Sword, 514
Bruno, 249, 399, 424, 434 *ff.*, 511
Bruno, abbot of Clugny, 428
Bruno of Cologne, 510
Buddha, 199
Bulgarians, 253, 256, 407
Burghers, increase in importance, 570
Burgundian Code, 363
Burgundians, 145, 232, 302
Burgundy united with Germany, 406
Byzantine Empire, 126, 405
Byzantine historians, 16

C

Cæcilius, 95
Cæsar, Augustus, 48, 94, 318
Cæsar, Julius, 48
Cæsar, Tiberius, 48
Cæsarins, 538
Caius, 80, 86
Calatrava, order of, 514
Calendar of saints, 378
Calistus, 358
Calixtus I., 177, 452
Calixtus II., 472
Callistus, 160, 163
Calvin, 333
Camaldolites, 429 *ff.*, 445
Candles, 220
Canon law, 143, 246, 370, 549
Canonisation, 379
Canons of the Church, 142, 144, 145, 266, 329
Canossa, 463 *ff.*
Canute, 407, 409
Capitula Angilramni, 331
Capuchins, 539
Caracalla, 103
Carloman, 216, 304, 307
Carmelites, 520, 539
Carnales, 338
Caroline Books, 283
Carolingian Empire, 321, 386, 387, 391
Carolingian policy of division of rule, 320, 348
Carthage, Church of, 449
Carthage, Council of, 171
Carthusians, 510, 570
Cassian, 211, 213, 521
Cassiodorus, 330
Catacombs, 268
Catechists, 63
Catechumens, 374, 375
Catharii, 511

Catharists, 560
Catholic Church, 5, 75, 107, 148; unity of, 156, 157
Cedd, Bishop, 239
Celestine, 168, 174
Celestine III., 362, 364, 551
Celestine V., 512, 538
Celestines, 512, 538
Celibacy, 64, 143, 161, 181, 190, 203, 220, 247, 266, 300, 355, 356, 420, 436, 439, 442, 450, 452, 453 *ff.*, 544, 564
Celsus, 95
Celtic missionaries, 164, 246
Celts, 235, 237, 241, 244
Chalcedon, Council of, 172, 174, 184, 194, 218, 294, 297, 349
Chapter, 584 *ff.*
Charity, 159, 198, 364, 365
Charlemagne, *see* Charles the Great.
Charles the Bald, 319, 342, 385
Charles the Fat, 321, 385, 386, 387
Charles the Great, 9, 126, 187, 217, 234, 248, 249, 250, 253, 254, 255, 258; life of, 307–308; controls Papacy, 308; reforms Church, 309; Emperor, 309–312; results of his rule, 312–317; character, 317; successors, 319–320; 331, 334, 339, 341, 348, 354, 363, 366, 372; decline of his empire, 384, 385, 389; 392, 393, 395, 398, 400, 405, 410, 412, 414, 443, 446, 455, 471, 486, 487
Charles Martel, 245, 247, 258, 303, 487
Charles the Simple, 385, 390
Charroux, synod of, 358
Chiersy, synod of, 334
Childerick III., 304
Chivalry, 490, 502, 506
Chosroes II., 484
Christ, order of, 514
Christendom, size in 604, 231; extent in 13th century, 259
Christianity, 46; illegal, 93; 102, 107; spread of, 113; 126, 128, 149, 150; in first and second centuries, 203; spread to Ireland, 240; Scotland, 241; materialised, 270; political philosophy of early, 289; not a "religio licita," 290; compared with Roman religion, 292; compared with Mohammedanism, 426, 481
Christians, number of, 54; 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107; number in 305, 113; in Rome, 148; number, 259; 268; increase of, 291; refuse to conform, 291
Chrysostom, 139, 167, 232, 271
Church and state, 423, 435,
Church, apostolic, compared, 160 *ff.*
Church Canons, 142, 144, 145
Church Christian, sources on, 12; in New Test., 15; contributions of Jews and pagans, 53; organisation, 55, 56; Roman Empire a model, 148; changes in, 149; early evils, 163; unity of, 169; changes in, 180; property, 190; necessary for salvation, 194; secularised, 201; worldliness in, 203; reflects its age, 260; compared with the state, 292; recognises supremacy of the state, 292; union with state not all evil, 293; paganised, 293; rules Europe for 1000 years, 294; ruled by Empire after Constantine, 294, 295; alienation of property forbidden, 296; in 7th and 8th century, 300; receives property from Clovis, 302; Pepin 303; and Charles the Great, 312; divided into 22 archbishoprics, 315; declines, 322; constitution of, 337; and state, 338; founded on Peter, 343; moral arch of safety, 356; slavery, 356; peace, 358 *ff.*; private war, 358; ordeals, 362; charity, 365; discipline, 366; worship, 370; sacraments, 373; above state, 418; corruptions, 422; in 1073, 445; property, sale of, 451; feudalised, 455; wealth of, 501; crusades, 502; attains its claims, 569; extent and wealth, 574; good and evil, 600 *ff.*; in 13th century, 602 *ff.*

Church Fathers, deplore vices in Church, 180; 191, 201; command asceticism, 203, 216; approve images, 272, 276; and the state, 290; 318, 330, 357, 365, 376
Church government, system of, 60; evolution of, 64; 184; regulated, 297; 446
Church history, study of, 1–10; sources on, 10–11; not theology, 7; revival of interest in, 7
Church officers, 57, 162, 260, 455
Churches, endowed in Rome, 118; 265; decorated, 272; and shrines, 378; erected to Our Lady, 381; erected in Holy Land, 484
Cicero, 41, 42, 93
Cistercians, 249, 511, 570, 591
Civil law, 452
Civilisation, mediæval, 381, 505
Clairvaux, 570
Clarenius, 538
Classical influences, 260
Claudius, 48, 113
Claudius, Bishop of Turin, 283
Clement II., 410, 427, 434
Clement III., 362, 467, 546, 579, 589
Clement VIII., 526
Clement of Alexandria, 80, 86, 269
Clement of Rome, 57, 80, 84, 86, 153, 155, 160, 177
Clergy, houses, 64; reformed, 190; regulated, 297; influence of, 354; incomes, 355; higher, 420–422; under Gregory VII., 448; in 13th century, 517; criticised, 571; cut off from laity, 587 *ff.*
Clermont, Council of, 360, 489, 492
Clovis, 234, 302, 303
Clugniacs, 199; reformation, 424 *ff.*; 435
Clugny, 428 *ff.*, 434, 436, 490
Cœlestius, 173
Coleman, Bishop, 239
College of Cardinals, 439 *ff.*, 580
Columba, 241, 264
Columbanus, 164, 242, 243
Columbus, 253, 505
Commodion, 80
Commodus, 103
Common people, 45
Communism, 64
Concordat of Worms, 472, 473, 545, 582
Concubinage, 451
Confession, 218, 352, 367, 426, 596
Confirmation, 352, 375
Conrad of Franconia, 390
Conrad II., 407 *ff.*, 455
Conrad III., 496
Constantia, 141, 271
Constantine, 9, 54, 106; Roman Empire under, 112; life of, 113 *ff.*; vision of the cross, 117 *ff.*, 125; character, 121 *ff.*; successors, 127; Arian controversy, 139 *ff.*; 159; legalised Christianity, 160; 162; aid to Church, 175; 219, 232, 269, 270, 271; subjects Christianity to the state, 292; 294, 318, 331, 336, 354, 365, 372, 374, 379
Constantine II., 144
Constantine V., 277, 280
Constantinople, fall of, 286, 449
Constantinople, second Council of, 145, 178, 281, 282
Constantinople, synod of, 277
Constantius, 144, 294
Constantius Chlorus, 113, 114, 115
Constitution of Lothair, 395
Constitution of Otto I., 395
Conte, Le, 333
Conversion, mediæval, 231 *ff.*
Converts, pagan, 180
Cornelius, 79
Corpus Juris Canonici, 338, 360, 588, 589
Corruptions in the Church in 10th and 11th centuries, 422; 13th century, 563
Council, Reform, of 1074, 450
Councils, 162, 237, 266, 294, 313, 376, 421, 452, 471, 544
Credulity of Western Europe, 487
Creed, Nicene, 171
Creighton, 17
Crescentius, 403
Cross, 269, 271
Cross bearers, order of, 514

Crusades, 249, 258, 377, 404, 450; causes, 483 *ff.*; time, purpose, and number, 491 *ff.*; first, 493 *ff.*; second, 496 *ff.*; third, 497; fourth, 498; minor crusades, 498 *ff.*; failed, 499; results, 500 *ff.*; children's, 492; against heretics, 561
Culdees, 241, 252
Culture, 198
Curia, Roman, 562
Cyprian, 80, 82, 107, 155, 158, 159, 160, 205, 372
Cyril, 139, 168
Cyrillus, 254, 255, 256
Czechs, 253, 388

D

Damascus, 181
Damasus, 295, 330, 434
Damiani, 371, 373, 432 *ff.*, 436, 438, 441, 442
Danes, 253, 388, 391, 392, 399, 401, 407
David, Sultan, 493
Deacons, 56, 364
Decian persecution, 203
Decius, 98, 104, 105
Decretals, 173; of Gregory I., 174
Decretum Gratiani, 589
Dedication of churches, 352
De Gama, 505
De Moulin, 333
Democracy of Papacy, 300
Denis, St., 74, 164
Denmark, Church in, 250, 251
Deposition of a Pope, 297
"Deposito Martyrum," 81
Devil, 354
Dictatus Papæ, 448
Didymus, Blind, 139
Diet of Worms, 434, 460
Dioceses, 349
Diocletian, 98, 105, 112, 114
Dionysius Areopagite, 373
Dionysius Exiguus, 330, 334
Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, 80, 86
Dionysius of Alexandria, 137
Dionysius of Rome, 137, 156
Discipline, 366, 376
Divorce not permitted, 356, 564
Doctrine of Addai, 81
Doctrines, 591
Doge of Venice, 430
Dogma, 295, 572
Döllinger, 17
Dominic, St., 518, 519 *ff.*; youth and education, 521; goes to France, 522; rebukes the Cistercians, 522; founds St. Rouen, 523; order approved by Innocent III., 523; organisation, 524; spread, 525; death, 525, 570
Dominicans, 259, 432, 502, 521, 525 *ff.*, 570, 591
Dominicus, St., 429
Domitian, 100, 101
Domitilla, 100
Donation of Constantine, 332, 334
Donation of Pepin, 306
Donatists, 136, 189
Donatus, 212
Dorylæum, battle of, 495
Dryer, 17
Dunstan, St., 427
Duran de Husce, 519

E

East and the West, breach between, 438
Easter, date of, 143, 155, 160, 220, 239, 240, 266
Eastern Church, 155, 184, 231, 266
Eastern Church and Western compared, 286
Eastern Empire, 502; estranged from the Western, 503, 549
Ebionites, 132, 136
Ebo, Archbishop of Rheims, 250, 335
Ecclesia and Jewish kingdom, 56
Ecclesiastical monarchy, 301
Edessa, fall of, 496
Edict of Milan, 119, 174
Edict of 380, 128
Education, under Charles the Great, 317, 356
Ekkehard, 401
Elders, duties of, 59
Election of clergy, 193
Election of Pope, 296, 297, 298
Elias, 210

Elizabeth, 46
Elvira, Council of, 163
Elvira, synod of, 268, 276
Emerton on study of Church history, 1
Emperor, 289, 295; German, 445, 446; Eastern, and crusades, 491
Empire, prosperous, 40; moral condition, 46; union with Papacy, 175; spiritualised, 293; revival under Otto I., 391; and Papacy, 398; distracted, 549
Eon de l'Etoile, 558
Ephesus, Council of, 168, 171, 294
Ephraëm, 139
Episcopal cases taken out of secular courts, 337
Erasmus, 332
Erfurt, Council of, 453
Eric, 251, 252
Eschylus, 43
Esquimos, 252
Essenes, 44, 200, 209
Estates of the Church, 365
Ethelbert, 236, 237, 238
Eucharist, 266, 363, 370, 372, 373, 374, 558
Eudoxia, 167
Eugenius II., 361
Eugenius III., 496
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 15, 54, 71, 81, 102, 106, 117, 118, 139, 141, 211, 271
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 139
Eustace of Bouillon, 494, 495, 496
Eustathius, 210
Evagrius, 15
Ewald, 165, 244, 249
Exarchs, 349
Excommunication, 155, 157, 158, 172, 367 *ff.*, 561, 576 *ff.*, 597
Exorcists, 63
Extreme unction, 377, 597, 598

F

Fabiola, 365
Fasting, 203, 220, 367
Felix II., 145, 185
Festival of All Saints, 378
Festival of All Souls, 378
Festival of Orthodoxy, 282
Festival of the Annunciation, 381
Festival of the Ascension of Mary, 381
Festival of the Purification of Mary, 381
Festivals multiplied, 161, 193, 375
Feudalism, 217, 389, 503, 505, 515, 574
Filioque, 266, 285
Finances of Rome, 445
Fisher, 17
Flagellants, 432, 506
Flavian, 9, 167
Flavius Clemens, 100
Florence, Council of, in 1439, 285
Fontevraud, order of, 511
Formosus, 386, 387, 419
Fortunatus, 155
Foulques de Neuilly, 519
France, beginnings of, 231
Francis, St., 9, 518, 526 *ff.*; early career, 526 *ff.*; forms an order, 528 *ff.*; confirmed by Pope, 529; labours, 530; death and canonisation, 530; his influence, 531; growth of the order, 532; compared with Dominic, 533 *ff.*; later history, 538 *ff.*, 570
Franciscans, 259, 432, 502, 524, 526 *ff.*, 570, 591
Frankfort, Council of, 369
Franks, 234, 235, 249, 302 *ff.*
Fratricelli, 538
Frederick II., Emperor, 498, 550, 577
Frederick Barbarossa, 497
Frederick, Bishop, 252
Frederick the Great, 318
Frederick of Lorraine becomes Pope, 438
Free cities, 503, 505, 506
Freeman, 4
French Revolution, 429
Fridolin, 243
Fulda, monastery at, 248
Fulk of Neuilly, 498

G

Gaius, 93
Galerius, 106, 114, 115

Gall, St., 243
Gallienus, 105
Gallus, 165, 243
Gama, De, 505
Gautbert, 253
Gebhard, 437 *ff.*
Gelasius, 167, 174, 573
Genseric, 184
Gerach of Reichersberg, 518
Gerbert, 399, 402, 404, 425, 426
German Church, 247, 394
German cloisters, 429
German kingdom, 391
German Pope, first, 403; Popes, 425
Germanus, 278
Germany, origin of, 321; 244; influences, 260
Geyza, Prince, 257
Geography, 505
Ghibellines, 549
Gibbon, 16, 73
Gieseler, 3, 17
Gilbert, 512, 516
Gilbertines, 512
Gnostics, 132, 136, 202, 268
Goddana, 210
Godfrey of Bouillon, 494, 495, 496, 513
Godfrey of Tuscany, 442
Gontran, King, 242
Goths, 145, 302
Gottschalk, 254
Grammont, order of, 510
Gratian, 128, 167, 171, 368, 434, 589
Grecian religion, 42
Greek, 41
Greek Catholics, 76
Greek Church, 231, 233, 257, 449
Greek Fathers, 170
Greeks, 401
Greenland, 252
Gregory of Tours, 16, 73, 319
Gregory I., the Great, 9, 167, 185, 191, 216, 218, 231, 236, 242, 270, 274, 275, 276, 298, 329, 336, 344, 358, 365, 368, 370, 371, 380, 389, 440, 441
Gregory II., 245, 278, 279, 300
Gregory III., 247, 280, 300, 303
Gregory V., 403, 404, 425, 426, 427
Gregory VI., 410, 420, 434, 455
Gregory VII., 173, 339, 369, 432; election, 446; beliefs, 447 *ff.*; reform efforts, 450 *ff.*; opposition, 453 *ff.*; investiture strife, 457 *ff.*; Henry IV., 462 *ff.*; driven from Rome, 467; dies in exile, 467; character, 467 *ff.*; influence, 470; crusader, 488; 545
Gregory VIII., 546
Gregory IX., 537, 538
Gregory X., 526, 539
Gregory Nanzianzen, 349
Gregory of Utrecht, 248
Grosseteste, 590
Gualbert, St. John, 431
Guelphs, 549
Guericke, 17
Guido of Spoleto, 386
Guilds, 576
Guiscard, 441, 449, 494
Gwatkin, 17

H

Hadrian, Emperor, 102
Hadrian I., Pope, 281
Hadrian II., 355, 418
Hagenbach, 17
Hakam, 485
Hakon the Good, 251
Halimand, Archbishop, 436
Halitgar, 250
Hanseatic League, 506
Harnack, 17, 58
Harold Klak, King, 250
Hase, 17
Hatch on Church history, 4, 58
Hauck, 17
Heaven, 354, 381
Hefele, 17
Hegesippus, 15
Hegira, 480, 481
Helena, 113
Heliogabalus, 103
Hell, 354, 381
Helvidius, 220
Henke, 16
Henry I., 390, 420
Henry II., 241, 406 *ff.*, 424, 426, 572, 577
Henry III., 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 420, 424, 427, 434, 437, 438, 439, 456

Henry IV., 360, 363, 437, 439, 446, 451, 459 *ff.*, 461, 463 *ff.*, 467, 577
Henry V., 471, 472
Henry VI., 498, 549, 550
Henry VIII., 318
Henry the Fowler, 424
Henry of Lausanne, 559
Heraclius, 484
Heresy, 143, 145, 153, 154, 157, 165, 183, 184, 205, 220, 247, 295, 517, 557 *ff.*, 564, 572, 576
Heretics, 173, 268, 293, 368, 501, 539, 560, 561
Hergenröther, 17
Hermits, 199, 206 *ff.*
Herod, 79
Herzog, 17
Hieracus, 205
Hierarchy, 176, 198, 260
Hilarion, 208, 210
Hilarius, 61
Hilary, 144, 164
Hildebrand, 9, 191, 363, 424, 426, 429, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 441 *ff.*; chosen Pope, 500, 545, 548, 565
Hildebrandine reformation, 490
Hincmar, 332, 336, 341, 361, 369
Hippolytus, 80, 177
Hispania, 331
Hirshau, 431
Holy Ghost, order of, 515
Holy Roman Empire, 344, 401, 411 *ff.*
Holy Water, 372, 572
Honoratus, 164
Honorius, 240, 295
Honorius II., 442, 513, 519
Honorius III., 364, 520, 524
Hosius, 118, 141, 144
Hospitalers, 502
Hospitals, 365
Hottinger, 16
House of Commons in England, 504
Hugh, abbot of Clugny, 429
Hugh Capet, 387
Hugh of Provence, 392
Hugh of St. Victor, 373
Hugh of Vienne, 525
Hugh the Great, 392
Hugh the Long, 494, 495
Hugo, Cardinal, 446, 447
Humbert, Cardinal, 436
Hume, 16
Humiliati, 512
Hungarians, 385, 493
Huodo, Count, 401
Hurst, 17
Hymns, 371

I

Iceland, 252
Iconoclasti, 277
Iconoclastic controversy, 267, 282 *ff.*, 300, 304, 309
Iconolatræ, 277
Ignatius of Antioch, 75, 80, 86, 159, 177, 336
Images, not used by early Christians, 268; edict against, 278, 379; 501
Image worship, 161, 267 *ff.*, 269, 273 *ff.*, 279 *ff.*, 302
Imperial theory of church and state, 413, 414
Incense, 220
Independence of Pope, 302
Indulgences, 377, 501, 560, 561, 572, 595, 596
Index, 573
Industry, 198
Innocent I., 167, 170, 171, 172, 181, 452, 596
Innocent II., 362
Innocent III., 9, 191, 287, 339, 362, 364, 369, 389, 413, 436, 498, 500, 502, 510, 515, 519, 522, 544, 545; early life, 545; enters Church, 546; chosen Pope, 547; ideas and reform policy, 547 *ff.*; becomes head of Europe, 549 *ff.*; asserts supremacy over the East, 555; rules North, 556; champions crusades, 556, 557; sought to crush heresy, 557 *ff.*; character and influence, 560 *ff.*, 596
Innocent IV., 525, 526, 580
Innocent V., 525
Inquisition, 364, 501, 539, 564, 565, 573
Inquisitors General, 560
Interdict, 369, 370, 577, 578
International peace, 503
Interpreters, 63
Investiture, 436, 442

Iona, 241
Ireland, 240, 241, 250
Irenæus, 57, 80, 86, 107, 151, 157, 177, 268, 291
Irene, 311
Isidore of Seville, 330, 333, 334, 349
Italian monasteries, 429
Italians, 394
Italy, origin of, 321; reunited with East, 296; hated Greeks and Lombards, 300; independence of, 550

J

James, 78, 79, 561
Janitors, 63
Janssen, 17
Jerome, 61, 81, 165, 181, 210, 211, 213, 219, 230, 330, 485
Jerusalem, 48; massacre, 496; capture, 497
Jesus, teachings of, 49, 55, 82, 85, 101, 103; and asceticism, 200; and civil government, 289, 364; and slavery, 356; and baptism, 374
Jewish church, 46, 204
Jewish synogogue, 59; passover, 266
Jews, 189, 260, 276, 277, 358, 501
Joannes, 208
Johannus Turrecrenta, 332
John, 78, 86
John, King of England, 369, 549, 552–555
John I., 296
John II., 179, 296
John VIII., 418
John X., 419
John XI., 429
John XII., 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 419, 424
John XIII., 398, 402, 425
John XIV., 402
John XV., 379, 403
John XVI., 404
John XIX., 407, 408, 420
John of Damascus, 274, 279, 280
John of Gorz, 399
John the Greek, 402
John of Syracuse, 189
John, St., 237
John, St., order of, 512
Joseph, 46
Jovinian, 219, 220
Judaism, 476, 479
Judas Iscariot, 79
Judgment of God, 361–364
Julian, Emperor, 127, 145, 271
Julian I., 166, 171, 181
Julius Paulus, 93
Julius, Pope, 144
Jus ecclesiasticum, 589
Justin II., 185
Justinian, 179, 187, 294, 296, 297
Justin Martyr, 291
Jutes, 235
Juvenal, 46

K

Katerkamp, 17
Keble, 17
Kentigern, St., 241
Kilian, 165
Knights of Emancipation, 515
Koethe, prophecy about Church history, 8
Koraish priests, 479, 480
Koran, 502
Kurtz, 17
Kylian, 243

L

Lactantius, 81, 118, 220
Laity cut off from clergy, 193, 198; in 12th century, 353; 448, 451, 571, 572
Lambert, 386
Lanfranc of Canterbury, 442
Langton, Stephen, 553, 554
Las Casas, 525
Lateran Councils, 360, 408, 439, 557, 562, 563, 564
Latin, 41; used in worship, 371
Latin Christianity, 46, 400
Latin Church, 16, 255
Latin Empire of Constantinople, 498, 502
Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, 502
Laurentius of Amalfi, 434
Law, imperial, controls the Church, 295

Law, study of, 503; under Innocent III., 567
Lawrence, 296
Laws of Charles the Great, 315 *ff.*
Lay investiture, 449; origin, 457; opposition, 458; Henry IV. and, 459 *ff.*; compromise in 1111, 471; Concordat of Worms, 472, 545
Laying on of hands, 375
Lazarus, order of, 515
Lechfeld, battle of, 393
Lectors, 62
Legatine power, 501
Lent, 266, 370
Leo the Armenian, 282
Leo, King of Armenia, 555
Leo I., 168, 174, 182, 344, 374, 452
Leo III., the Isaurian, 277, 278
Leo III., Pope, 310, 440–441
Leo IV., 340, 364
Leo VIII., 397–398, 424
Leo IX., 424, 436, 438
Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis, 273
Lex Visigothorum, 330
Libanus, 219
Liber Pontificalis, 330
Liberatus, 349
Liberius, 145
Licinius, 116, 118, 124
Lingard, 17
Literature, bourgeois, 570–571
Liturgy, 254, 352
Lollards, 283
Lombard, Peter, 373, 378, 525, 592
Lombards, 233, 303 *ff.*, 308, 549
Lombardy, crown of, 392, 409
Longobards, 145
Loofs, 17
Lord's Prayer, 356, 371
Lord's Supper, *see* Eucharist.
Lothair, 319 *ff.*
Lothair II., 336
Louis the Child, 387, 389, 420
Louis the German, 254
Louis the Pious, 216, 217, 250, 253, 255, 319 *ff.*, 335, 363, 378, 395
Louis II., 320, 340, 341
Louis IV., 393
Louis VII., 496, 504
Louis IX., 498, 526
Louis X., 504
Lucifer, 144
Lucius, King, 73
Lucius I., 452
Ludolph, 393, 394
Luitgarde, St., 566
Luitprand, King of Lombards, 302, 399
Lull, 248
Luther, 3, 219, 434, 451, 536, 546
Lyons, 73
Lyons, Council of, 285

M

Macarius, 141, 208, 213
Mæcenas, 94
Magdeburg Centuries, 332
Magellan, 505
Magna Charta, 554, 555
Magyars, 256, 391, 393, 399
Majola, abbot of Clugny, 429
Mamno of Cologne, 438
Manichæans, 105, 132, 133, 189
Marcella, 211
Marcellus, 139, 141
Marcia, 103
Marcian, 155, 156
Marco Polo, 505
Marcus Aurelius, 102
Marozia, 419
Marriage, 181, 204, 255, 266, 356, 378, 407, 420, 424, 430, 432, 436, 448, 453, 564
Marsiglio of Padua, 332
Martel, Chas., 302
Martin, St., 164
Martin of Tours, 212
Martin I., 299
Martyrs, 193, 270, 378, 380
Mary, Virgin, 46, 193, 356, 381
Mass, 189, 193, 217, 218, 352, 370, 572, 593, 594
Massacre of Jerusalem, 496
Matthew, 80
Matthias Flacius, 16
Maurice, 299
Maurus, 512
Maxentius, 115, 117, 123, 269
Maximian, 114, 115
Maximus of Salona, 368
Maximus the Thracian, 104
Maximus of Turin, 170
McGiffert, 17

Mediæval Papacy, 5, 183, 201, 234, 293, 389
Meersen, treaty of, 321
Meister Echart, 525
Melania, 210, 211
Melchiades, 331
Mercurius, St., 427
Merovingian kings, 348
Methodius, 205, 254, 255, 256
Metropolitans, 61, 337, 348, 349, 581, 582
Michael III., 254, 284
Middle Ages, 16, 198
Mieczyslav, Duke, 256
Milan, Council of, 144
Mileve, Council of, 171
Milman, 17
Milvian Bridge, 116, 117, 118, 123
Minims, 539
Miracles, 220, 501
Missionary monks, 198
Missionary zeal of Rome, 152, 153, 164, 198, 229 *ff.*, 233, 251, 254, 255, 259, 303
Mistiwoi, 254
Moeller, 17
Mohammed, 318, 450, 476 *ff.*
Mohammedanism, 258, 277, 278, 293, 476 *ff.*, 482 *ff.*
Monarchians, 134, 253
Monastery, first walled, 209
Monastic abuses, 407, 427, 516
Monastic orders, decline of, 515
Monastic Rule, 242
Monasticism, Christian, 45, 185, 190, 198, 199 *ff.*, 204 *ff.*, 209, 210, 211, 212, 217, 218, 220 *ff.*, 239, 243, 249, 254, 421, 424, 429, 486, 502, 510, 516
Monk, the ideal man, 198, 199, 217, 352
Monks, 421, 517
Monotheism, 46
Montanism, 135, 136, 177, 202
Montesta, order of, 514
Moors, 514
Morality, 198, 353, 354, 563
Moravians, 254
Mosheim, 16
Moymir, 254
Müller, 17
Muratorian canon, 81
Music in worship, 193, 270, 371, 372
Mysticism, 570

N

Napoleon, 4, 307, 318, 386, 399, 406, 408, 412, 470, 514
Napoleon III., 307
National churches, 322
National states, rise of, 320
Neo-Cæsarea, Council of, 163
Neo-Platonism, 199
Nepotism, 563
Nero, 84, 99, 100
Nerva, 101
Nestorian controversy, 272
Newman, 17
New Testament, 15
Nicæa, 495
Nicæa, Council of, 120, 131 *ff.*, 142 *ff.*, 153, 155, 162, 171, 175, 176, 178, 232, 281, 282, 293, 331, 380
Nicene Creed, 142, 143, 144, 145, 171, 234, 266, 314
Nicholas I., 255, 256, 283, 322, 332, 333, 334, 336, 340 *ff.*, 344, 364, 389, 413, 418
Nicholas II., 360, 439, 441, 442
Nicholas of Cusa, 332
Niedner, 17
Nilus, 272, 427, 429
Nippold, 17
Nithard, 253
Norbert, St., 511
Norman conquest, 241, 362, 408
Normans, 408, 449
Northmen, 251, 385 *ff.*
Norway, 251
Norway, King of, 449
Novatianists, 135, 156
Nuns, 352, 421
Nurses, order of, 515

O

Obotrites, 388
Observants, 539
Odilo, abbot of Clugny, 429, 433
Odo, abbot of Clugny, 428
Odo of Eudes, 386, 387
Odoacer, 296
Olaf, 251, 252
Olaf the Saint, 252
Oldratus, John, 512

Old Testament, 48
Olga, Grand Duchess, 257
Oligarchy in Church of fourth century, 169
Optatus, Bishop of Mileve, 9, 73, 169
Ordeals, 361 *ff.*
Ordination, 377
Origen, 80, 82, 86, 137, 177, 205
Orosius, 170
Orphanages, 365
Orr, 17
Orthodoxy of the West, 143, 153, 165, 181
Ostrogoths, 232, 296
Oswy, King, 239
Otgar, 335
Otto, Duke of Saxony, 390
Otto I., the Great, 126, 253, 255, 257, 258, 318, 390 *ff.*, 420, 421, 424, 425, 443, 487
Otto II., 253, 394, 401 *ff.*, 425
Otto III., 402 *ff.*, 420, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 430
Otto IV., 550
Otto of Brunswick, 550

P

Pachomius, 209
Pachomius, Rule of, 212
Pagan and Christian Rome, 55
Paganism, 113, 120, 127, 128, 149, 180, 190, 247, 252, 501
Palæmon, 209
Palestine creed, 142
Pallium, 576
Palmers, 485
Pammachus, St., 365
Pantheon, 378, 380
Papa, or Pope, 173
Papacy, rise of, 148, 159, 160, 164 *ff.*, 169, 175, 176, 177, 182, 189, 193, 259, 284, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 301, 306, 309, 320 *ff.*, 336, 339, 340, 370, 404, 406, 412–414, 419, 423, 440, 441, 517, 549, 561, 566, 569
Papacy, decline of, 389, 394, 410, 419, 420, 434, 559
Papacy and Empire, 391
Papal constitution, 337, 445
Papal court, 580, 590
Papal hierarchy, 143, 176, 299, 344, 575
Papal penitentiary, 589, 590
Papal theory of relation of Church and state, 316, 413, 569
Papias, 80, 86
Paris, Council of, 334
Parish, 365, 387
Paschal II., 429, 471, 472, 545
Paschal III., 315
Paschasius Radbertus, 372
Pastor, 17
Pastoraux, 506
Patriarch of Constantinople, 296
Patriarch, 61; of the West, 143, 156, 349
Patriarchs of the East, 156
Patrician of Rome, 308, 410
Patrick, St., 240, 241
"Patrimony of St. Peter," origin, 307, 394
Paul, 46, 54, 72, 73, 74, 77, 79, 84, 86, 87, 100, 148, 151, 170, 248, 290, 356, 364, 440
Paul of Nola, 211
Paul of Thebes, 203, 205
Paul II., 581
Paula, 210, 211
Paulina, 365
Peace, international, 503
Peace of God, 358
Peace, universal, 46
Pelagius, 171, 173, 297, 298, 299
Pelagius II., 187, 298
Penalties, 367
Penance, 352, 370, 375, 376, 595, 596
Penitential books, 376
Pepin, 248, 300, 303, 304, 306, 363, 372
Perry, 17
Persecution, 99 *ff.*, 108, 116, 119, 152, 157, 203, 560
Persius, 46
Peter, 57, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 100, 151, 153, 159, 166, 170, 237, 239, 246, 259, 284, 290, 336, 343, 433, 440, 448, 451, 561
Peter of Alexandria, 81
Peter Comester, 332
Peter of Corbeil, 545
Peter the Great, 318
Peter the Hermit, 490, 493

Peter and Paul, 151
Peter Waldo, 559
Peter's primacy, 78, 79, 151, 170
Peter's See, 159
Petrine theory, 76, 77, 82, 85, 87, 107, 169, 170, 175, 177, 188, 337, 544
Pharisees, 44
Philip, 61
Philip I., 494
Philip IV., 514
Philip VI., 504
Philip the Arabian, 104
Philip Augustus, 369, 497, 549, 551, 577
Philip of Hohenstaufen, 550
Philosophy of early Christians, 202
Photius, 257, 283, 343
Piacenza, Council of, 489
Pictures, 270
Picts, 241
Pierre de Bruys, 558
Pilgrimages, 161, 193, 270, 367, 484, 485, 486, 501
Pindar, 43
Plato, 43, 48
Pliny, governor of Bithynia, 290
Pluralism, 563, 565
Plutarch, 47
Poitiers, synod of, 358
Poland, 449
Poles, 253, 388
Polycarp, 155, 177
Polytheism, 46
Pontifex Maximus, 149, 152, 160, 289, 292
Poor Catholics, 519
Poor Clares, 530
Poor-houses, 365
"Poor Man," 519
Poor Men of Lyons, 519, 560
Pope favours kingship of Pepin, 304
Popes, 61, 154, 159, 173, 180, 233, 234, 259, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 302, 310, 312, 314, 316, 322, 336, 347, 348, 349, 355, 358, 394, 418, 423, 443, 488, 571, 575, 576
Popes, German, 445
Pornocracy, 419
Prayers for the dead, 220
Preaching, 371, 591
Precentor, 63
Prémontré, order of, 511
Presbyter, 57, 60
Priesthood, elevation of, 161; constitutes the Church, 339
Priests, 218; freed from secular courts, 338; duties, 352, 353; 421; in conflict with monks, 517; 586
Primates, 348, 581, 582
Prince Edward, 498
Pro-Pertine view, 77
Property of Pope, 306
Property renounced, 204
Protestant historians, 17, 76
Protestant revolt, 131
Protestant revolution, 131, 321
Provinces, 349
Prussians, 249
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 284, 326 *ff.*, 389, 418, 436, 448, 544, 548, 567, 589
Purgatory, 266, 352, 381, 560, 596
Puritans, Arabic, 479
Pusey, 17
Pythagoreans, 199

R

Radbert, 593
Radbod, 243, 244, 245
Radislaw, 254
Raimbold, Archb., 360
Ratherius, 399
Rathod, 333, 335, 336, 341, 342
Raymond, Count of Toulouse, 489, 494, 495, 516, 561, 562
Raymond of Puy, 512
Recollects, 539
Reformation, 3, 199, 203, 242, 296, 306, 355, 404, 406, 410, 423 *ff.*, 429, 436, 437, 448, 450, 451, 490, 502, 510, 518, 526, 544, 563, 565, 571
Relics, 161, 191, 193, 220, 245, 270, 306, 354, 378, 379, 380, 488, 501, 563, 572
Religion, definition of, 6
Religiosi, 217
Remini, Canons of, 294
Renaissance, 505, 526
Remould, St., 429, 430
Resemblances and differences of Eastern and Western Churches, 286

Richard I., 497, 549
Riculfus, 335
Rimbert, 251
Ritual, 161, 254, 255, 449, 591
Robanus Maurus, 372
Robert d'Arbrissel, 491, 511
Robert of Apulia, 459
Robert of Flanders, 494, 495
Robert of Molesme, 511
Robert of Normandy, 494, 495
Robertson, 17
Rochis, 216
Roman bishop becomes Pope, 193
Roman Catholic belief, 76
Roman Church, 77, 107, 150, 152, 153, 160, 164, 176, 231, 233, 239, 251, 257, 266, 295, 296, 300, 301, 344, 347, 365, 560, 574
Roman constitution, 289
Roman Emperor, 161
Roman Empire, 40, 95, 98, 112, 148, 161, 295, 312, 401
Roman hierarchy, 149 *ff.*
Roman language, 149, 190
Roman religion, 42
Roman see, 160
Romans, 398
Rome, 40, 48, 55, 148, 150, 159
Rome, Council of, 295
Romould, St., 431, 432
Rothe, 17
Rouen, St., 523
Rudolph of Swabia, 466 *ff.*
Rufinus, 211
Russia, 449
Russians, 253, 257, 388
Rutilius, 219

S

Sabbath, 255
Sabellians, 136, 137
Sabinian, 299
Sacerdotal class, 63
Sacramentaries, 372
Sacraments, 352, 370, 371, 372 *ff.*, 592 *ff.*
Sadducees, 44
Saints, 193, 270, 354, 501
Saint-worship, 378, 379
Saladin, 497
Sallust, 46
Salvation, 366
Samaritans, 45
Saracens, 308, 385, 388, 401, 419, 484
Sardica, Council of, 144, 165, 166, 171, 178, 181
Savonarola, 525
Saxons, 234, 249, 258, 308, 309, 318, 450
Schaff, 17
Schenkel, 17
Schism, 143, 156, 165
Schmidt, 16
Scholasticism, 526
Schools, 247
Schools of Rome, 48
Schroeckh, 16
Scotland, 241
Sebaldus, St., 250
Sects, rise of, 132, 157
Seculares, 218
See of Rome, 301
Seligenstadt, Council of, 590
Seljukian Turks, 485
Semi-Arians, 141, 142
Semish, 17
Semler, 16
Senators, 59
Seneca, 47
Separation of clergy and laity, 63
Separation of East and West, 143
Separation of Roman and Greek churches, 265, 285
Septimus Severus, 103
Serfdom, 504, 505
Sergius II., 340
Serviten, 512
Severinus, 244
Severus, 255
Shedd, 17
Sheldon, 17
Shrines, 378
Simeon, 46, 429
Simeon Stylites, 210
Simon de Monfort, 562
Simon Magnus, 81
Simony, 189, 407, 411, 421, 424, 426, 427, 430, 432, 436, 437, 439, 442, 448, 450, 455 *ff.*, 545, 564
Siricius, 173, 181, 220
Sirmium, Council of, 144
Sixtus V., 441
Slaves, 119, 190, 290, 356

Slave trade, 190
Slavic Church, 254, 255
Slavs, 253, 258, 308, 385, 388, 392, 399
Socrates, 15, 117
Soldiers of Jesus Christ, 525
Sophocles, 43
Soter, 80
Sources of history, 12–15
Sovereign power of Pope, 306
Spain, 449
Spanheim, 16
Spanish Church, 181
Spiritales, 338, 538
Stanley, 17
State and church, 545
States, 290, 423
"States of the Church," 307
Stephanus, King, 257
Stephen, 61, 156, 160
Stephen II., 305, 307
Stephen IV., 440
Stephen VI., 364, 386, 419
Stephen IX., 438
Stephen of Chartres, 494
Stephen of Lisiac, 510
Stephen of Tigerno, 510
Stephen of Tournai, 332
Stolberg, 17
Strauss, 17
Stubbs, 17
Sturm, abbot, 248
Suetonius, 95
Suevi, 232
Suidbert, 249
Sulpicius Severus, 16
Sunday, 120, 237
Superstitions of Europe, 487, 501
Suso, Henry, 525
Sutri, Council of, 410
Swabians, 243
Sweden, 253
Swen, King, 251, 449
Swidbert, 165
Sylverius, 296
Sylvester II., 257, 364, 404, 406, 410, 425, 426, 488
Symmachus, 296
Synods, 162, 352
Syriac Church, 81

T

Tacitus, 46, 73, 95, 99, 101
Tanchelm, 558
Tancred, 494
Tauler, John, 525
Templars, 502
Temporal power of the Papacy, 301, 302
Temporal power subject to papal, 559
Tertullian, 57, 71, 73, 80, 84, 86, 106, 107, 137, 152, 159, 205, 268, 372, 381
Teutonic Knights, 502, 514
Teutonic Order, 250
Teutonic-Roman Church, 233, 234
Theodatus, 297
Theodora, 282, 419
Theodore, 139
Theodore of Canterbury, 377
Theodoret, 168
Theodoric, 296
Theodorus, 239
Theodosian Code, 296
Theodosius I., 128, 179
Theodosius II., 294
Theophano, 399, 401, 402
Theophilus, 331
Theosophists, 45
Therapeutæ, 200, 209
Third Estate in France, 504
Thirteenth century, 569
Thougbrand, 252
Thomas à Becket, 545
Tiberius, 71
Tithes, 574
Tithing, unjust, 436
Titus, 100
Toledo, synod of, 358
Toleration, edict of, in 311, 118
Tonsure, 64, 237, 266
Torres, 333
Tours, battle of, 258, 482
Tours, Council of, 437
Tozer, 17
Trajan, 98, 101
Transubstantiation, 370, 564, 593
Travel, 42
Treaties, 563
Treves, synod of, 591
Tribur, Council of, 463
Trinitarians, 139, 141
Trinity, 246
Trinity, order of the, 514
Troyes, Council of, 471

Truce of God, 359 *ff.*, 369, 409, 429, 490, 503
Trudbert, 243
Turks, 286
Tyre, Council of, 294

U

Ulfilas, 232
Ulpian, 104
Ulrich, 379
Union of Celtic and Roman churches, 239
Union of Church and state, 293
Union of Rome and Greece, 265, 266
Unity of belief, 157
Unity of the Church, 564
Universal Church, 185
Unni, 251
Urban II., 360, 429, 470, 489, 490, 514, 545
Urban VIII., 581
Ursinus, 295

V

Valens, 128, 219
Valentinian I., 128, 171, 179
Valentinian II., 128
Valentinian III., 167, 184, 294
Valerian, 105
Vallombrosians, 431
Vandals, 145, 232
Vaughan, 17
Venice, Patriarch of, 449
Verdun, massacre of, 249
Verdun, treaty of, 320, 321
Vespasian, 100
Victor, 155, 157, 160, 331
Victor III., 422, 470
Vienna, 73
Vigilantius, 220
Vigillus, 297, 299
Vincent Ferrier, 525
Vinland, 252
Virgin Mary, 193
Visigothic Code, 296
Visigoths, 232, 233
Visitors in the Church, 296
Vitalian, 371
Viterbo, 560
Vladimir, 257
Vulgate, 181, 237, 330, 331, 372

W

Waddington, 17
Waldenses, 560, 572
Walter of Cologne, 493
Walter the Penniless, 493
Wends, 253, 254, 388
Werenfrid, 244
West Franks, 399
Western Church, 160, 171, 231, 266, 295, 297, 298
Whitby, Council of, 239
Whitsunday, 375
Wiclif, 332, 451
Widows, order of, 204
Widukind, 399
Wilfred, 239
Wilfrid, 165
Willebrord, 165, 243, 245, 250
William of Bavaria, 431
William of Burgundy, 449
William the Conqueror, 450, 494
William of Normandy, 442
Willibald, 248
Worms, synod of, 363
Worship, 352
Wulfram, 244

Y

Yngrin, 250

Z

Zachariah, 46
Zacharias, 304, 305
Zealots, 45
Zeller, 17
Zephyrinus, 160, 331
Zeus, 43
Zosimus, 167

49596 270.3Q
F641
Flick, Alexander Clarence
Rise of the medieval church and its influence on civilization
49596 270.3Q
F 641